THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., Master of the Temple, c/o S.P.C.K. House, Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2, to whom MSS. should be sent.

Vol. XXIX NOVEMBER, 1934 No. 173

EDITORIAL

All Saints' Tide is an encouraging season, because it tells of the reception, by a great variety of human character, of the regenerating News. The Dominical Festivals renew for us our contact with that which is given and supernatural, with the divine arrival. We could not do without these. They recreate us. But All Saints' Tide shews their effect. Christmas Day and All Saints' Day together are like reading through the Epistle to the Romans twice, once in order to see the mind of the writer and the inspiration that was his, and a second time in order to imagine, as far as may be, what the Romans thought when they read it. The first reading is philosophical, the second psychological. Or, to take a better example, there is a children's book of New Testament stories which tells its stories from within. The home-life of the daughter of Jairus is described—her parents, her games, her pets and so on. Then she falls sick, and the Healer is brought in. It is a useful line of approach. And so to read of Augustine, Teresa, Martin, Hugh, Boniface and Crispin is to read the story of grace experienced, grace at the human end. One difficulty is that there is in the lives of many of the saints of the Calendar a highly specialized excellence, smelling rather exclusively of the sanctuary lamp. This elicited a robust but rather clumsy protest from Charles Kingsley in *The Saint's Tragedy*. Kingsley in his bold British way was attacking "those miserable dilettanti, who in books and sermons are whimpering meagre second-hand praises of celibacy." We know much more about sublimation to-day than Kingsley did, but even so there are not a few who unhappily have never been able quite to forget a certain visit, paid in their childhood, promiscuously and prematurely, to the National Gallery. The memory of that terrible morning, with its room after room of lean, uninteresting figures—

A bundle of bones,
Which fools adore!

—has poisoned what might have been noble and gracious associations. And yet, for all the gauntness of "these hands" displayed at Miletus to the Ephesian elders, St. Paul was a practical statesman; St. Augustine was a pioneer psychologist, St. Thomas Aquinas a master among the highbrows of his period, Sir Thomas More a first-rate Lord Chancellor, St. Teresa a woman with an admirable business head. Accordingly, if we can exhibit the teaching not merely of St. Cyprian on Undenominationalism and of St. Athanasius on "Religion without Revelation," but of St. Peter on Pessimism and of St. James on Sentimentality, we shall have a light from the Gospel on real modern problems, and we shall incidentally be rediscovering the essential meaning of those heroic figures which are bonily portrayed on the walls of the Umbrian Room. We shall rescue them from the bloodless immortality of a mere Church Calendar and set them where they belong, in the Lamb's Book of life.

It may be remembered that in August we published a letter from the Archdeacon of Taranaki, reporting a resolution of the General Synod of the Church in New Zealand in favour of a new format for the Bible. There is no doubt that it is of the utmost importance to make people feel that the Bible is a book that can be read. Benjamin Jowett said in 1860 that the Bible was to be interpreted like any other book. The statement aroused considerable indignation, and, as sometimes happens, unscrupulous persons quoted it in isolation, not remembering, or at least not recording, that he went on to say, "There are many respects in which Scripture is unlike any other book; these will appear in the results of such an interpretation." We can see now well enough what he meant; and indeed, in so far as the choice is between (*a*) putting the Bible in a class by itself and leaving it there, unread, and (*b*) approaching the Bible like any other book and reading it, there is no doubt which is the better. The trouble is that the Bible is not easy reading.

There are two main difficulties. One is unavoidable; the other we have largely laid upon ourselves. The inherent difficulty is that behind all parts of the Bible there lie historical situations which are not at once perceived. Genesis requires knowledge of anthropology and primitive religion, the Books of Kings and of the Prophets are only to be understood with the help of some acquaintance with the contemporary politics of Western Asia and the policies of such dominating figures as Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus. The New Testament marks the

end of a period of three or four centuries, the very formative post-Alexander period, about which most people know hardly anything. And it has a background of Roman Empire, later Jewish religion, economic hardship, Hellenic culture, Asiatic mysteries, ancient methods of literary composition, and much else with which not many are familiar. All this means study, and though the study of the Bible has been made much easier for this generation than it used to be, nearly all the laity and very many of the clergy begin with much less plain knowledge of the text than would have been the case two generations ago.

The second difficulty is man-made. It arises out of the way in which the Bible is presented to readers. To say lightly, as some have done, that the Bible is the worst-printed book in the world is to forget the marvellous accuracy with which all Bibles are printed. But nevertheless the format is unattractive. Double columns, thin paper and small type are found necessary, because we insist on having the whole Bible, a quite unnecessary thing, except for scholars. The mediæval chapters and verses represent a numbering which is not always according to the sense, and the Authorized Version inflicts upon us chapters apparently consisting of isolated verses, producing a staccato effect which is most misleading. Then there is the matter of arrangement. It would be difficult indeed to rearrange the Old Testament in such a way as to satisfy all the critics, including the late Professor Kennett. But there are a few simple and almost wholly agreed things that could be done. Isaiah xl. might now be allowed to begin a new book. The books of the Prophets and the Epistles of St. Paul ought to be printed, not as at present in the order of their length, but in the order (so far as that can be ascertained) in which they were written. It is ridiculous that Hosea should immediately follow Daniel. Bolder would it be to print the whole narrative of J continuously, but readers would be enormously interested if it could be done. Job might be printed like a play, with the names of the speakers clearly indicated; the dislocations might be removed from the book of Jeremiah; Ruth and Jonah might appear side by side, perhaps under the heading of "Liberal Catholicism," with a cross-reference to Nehemiah! In the New Testament there is much to be said for putting St. John's Gospel last. It would be the fitting climax. What then of the Apocalypse, which is also, in its way, a fitting climax? That might be put after Acts, as depicting the eager, visionary enthusiasm of early Christianity. The Epistles would then shew how the apocalyptic *motif* was gradually transmuted into the life of the supernaturally-created and supernaturally-maintained

but stable, terrestrial Catholic Church. Then the Fourth Gospel would shew the Catholic Christ face to face with the Imperial world.

Experiments have been made. There are the Revised Translations of Weymouth, R. G. Moulton (*The Modern Reader's Bible*, rearranged as well as retranslated, in six volumes, some now out of print), and Dr. Moffatt. In all of them there seems to be loss as well as gain. There are magnificent things in Moffatt, and as a commentary it is admirable, but the translation of Romans viii. 38, 39 is a disaster. There are the plain reproductions of the received text in modern book form, like the *Literary Text Bible* (8 vols., 1s. 6d. each, Marshall, Morgan and Scott), and the volumes of the *Temple Bible* and the Bible in *Everyman's Library*. The latter is arranged more or less chronologically. Mrs. Thomson Davies' *The Heart of the Bible* (3 vols., Allen and Unwin, 5s. each) gives large portions of the text and useful introductions. One of the merits of the Clarendon Bible, which is meant for serious study rather than for simple reading, is that it brings together Kings and relevant passages from the Prophets. *The Little Bible* (Oxford Univ. Press) is a very good volume of selections for the young. Dr. Inge's *Everyman's Bible* (Longmans) is an admirable anthology, but nothing more than an anthology. It is intended to be an appetizer, not a substitute.

Another experiment is now being made, for knowledge of which we are indebted to the courtesy of Messrs. J. M. Dent. They are initiating this month a new edition of the Bible in a form which is in keeping with the best modern book production and aims at encouraging the reader to read the Bible for sheer pleasure. This edition, which will be edited by Dr. M. R. James, the Provost of Eton, is being designed and hand-set by Rene Hague and Eric Gill, and will be decorated with engravings by Eric Gill. It will contain the text of the Authorized Version, incorporating, where necessary or helpful, words or phrases from the Revised Version. The numbering of the verses will appear only at the head of each page. Another scholarly edition of the New Testament is announced this month by Messrs. Murby. It is *The Documents of the New Testament*, translated, re-arranged, and furnished with introductions and occasional notes by Canon G. W. Wade. It is a marvel of compressed learning, critical and judicious.

In all this reproduction of the Bible thus summarily indicated the most important reforms seem to be (1) printing the Bible

like an ordinary modern book, (2) rearrangement of its contents, so that they appear in at least an approximately chronological order, and (3) leaving out a good deal. In spite of the outcry which would be raised in some quarters against playing tricks with Holy Scripture, we are persuaded (or as Dr. Moffatt unhappily would say, we are certain) that the third suggestion is as vital as any. The result of omission will be that the only parts of Holy Scripture which would in any case be read by the public will no longer be in danger of being swamped into oblivion. Then the Bible will once more become a bedside book, and a week-end book, and a holiday book, in fact a *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*. There will still remain the necessity of hard study, if there is going to be anything like thorough comprehension. But as soon as the Bible is made at all really available, it will be discerned that the people in the Bible are real people, and that behind them is the real God, the Eternal, Who Was, and Is, and Is to Come.

When St. Paul goes so far as to say in Galatians iii. 8 that the Scripture *foresaw* that through faith God would justify the Gentiles, we are inclined to dismiss it as an ebullition of his rabbinic bibliolatry. It is indeed a unique passage; the degree of personification is without parallel in the New Testament. And yet are we not continually verifying it, or something very like it, in experience whenever we use, as we do, the Bible as a clue to the meaning of life? Maurice found in the Bible "the interpretation of the history of mankind." When in 1848, the year of revolution, he gathered a few friends on Monday evenings to read the Bible together, they began with the Book of Genesis. Most of us to-day would probably choose some other book. Yet, to take only two examples, Sir James Jeans finds in Genesis i. 3 a sufficient description of the creation of the universe, and what preacher could want a better text for almost any sermon than Genesis xxvi. 18? St. Paul's attribution of foresight to the Scripture may be extravagantly picturesque, but it is not picturesque extravagance.

We regret that by inadvertence the Rev. G. H. Tremenheere was inaccurately described on p. 228 of the October number as a member of the Society of St. John the Evangelist.

DIOCESAN SYNODS

THE effort of the English Church in recent years to develop an efficient form of self-government has led in turn to a revival of the practice of holding diocesan synods. At the moment they are used as a means of providing the bishop and clergy of the diocese with opportunities for discussing some of the more pressing problems in modern Church life; for instance, synods were summoned to discuss the situation arising from the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book by Parliament and also to decide in what way a diocese should fittingly celebrate the centenary of the Oxford Movement. These synods partake more of the nature of a conference between the bishop and his clergy; they serve a twofold purpose in helping the clergy to gain a clearer understanding of the problems which confront the Church at the present time, and also of promoting a deeper sense of unity and fellowship within the diocese. If, however, diocesan synods are again to become an integral part of Church life they must develop into something more than a series of conferences. The world is growing tired at the very mention of the word conference or discussion; it has become symbolic of indecision and inaction. Conferences are ephemeral things: they have their day and disappear; the question arises as to whether diocesan synods are only to enjoy a merely temporal revival or if they are to be continuous: if so, they must become a permanent and efficient means of dealing with the everyday problems of diocesan life.

If we turn to the past history of the Church, we find in actual fact that the diocesan synod was the means by which the bishop exercised his legislative functions, the power to bind and loose; here the clergy disclosed the needs of the diocese, and the bishop legislated to meet these needs.* His decrees, made with the advice of the clergy, were binding on the consciences of all members of the diocese, whether clerical or lay, provided they were not contrary to the *jus Commune* of the whole Church. It is obvious that if the modern diocesan synod were to become a legislative body, important questions of Church government and discipline would be raised. We should be forced to deal

* It is doubted whether an edict or constitution of a bishop can claim to be called a law if made apart from a diocesan synod, unless the chapter has first been consulted. It would lack that permanence which is one of the necessary conditions of law. *Cf.* Benedict XIV., *De Synodo Diocesana*, 5. 4. 3, and 13. 5. 1.

with what is perhaps the greatest problem in modern Church government, the powers of a bishop: what he may and what he may not do, and how far a bishop is justified in deciding questions of faith and morals apart from the Church as a whole. In view too of the increasing share which is being given to the laity in the direction of Church affairs we shall be forced to make up our minds as to the share which they can take in synodical government. It is usually said that the laity are not represented in a synod; if, however, synods were to become a normal method of diocesan government, the laity would quite naturally claim to be present and to offer their advice with the clergy. Such a claim would justly deserve consideration.

The Church of England is in a singularly unfortunate position with regard to the revival of synodical government. Since the Reformation the Church of England has never legislated on the subject; there are no precedents to help and guide us. The object of this article is a brief review of the principles which the Church would do well to bear in mind in the revival of synods and the discussion of what two leading canonists who have devoted special treatises to diocesan synods have written as to their purpose, usefulness, and composition.

One line of approach to the subject would be the consideration of the regulations about diocesan synods as they are found in mediæval canon law; for instance, in the Decretal of Gregory IX. (c. 25. x. 5. 1) we find that diocesan synods are to be held annually for the purpose of promulgating what has been decreed in the provincial synod. In actual fact, however, this rule was often neglected; it is constantly being re-enacted in the decrees of various provincial councils. At Trent penalties were imposed on bishops who neglected to hold yearly synods, though they never seem to have been inflicted; in the eighteenth century we learn from Benedict XIV. (1740-1758) that the practice of holding diocesan synods had ceased in many parts of Europe owing to the force of contrary custom. In the Decretal of Gregory IX. (c. 4. x. 3. 10) we further find that bishops are unable to legislate in important matters without first consulting their cathedral chapters. Benedict XIV. (*De Synodo Diocesana*, xiii. 1. 4) explains that originally the bishop "cuius solius sententia ceterorum placito præponderaret" was bound to consult the whole synod before legislating in more important matters, so that his decrees might have a greater weight and authority; once, however, the advice of the synod had been asked he was not necessarily bound to take it. Since it was wellnigh impossible for the bishop to assemble all his clergy every time he wished to exercise his legislative power, the practice grew

up of consulting the chapter instead. Gradually it came about that the bishop was unable to legislate without first consulting his chapter. The chapter became a kind of perpetual synod, whose advice the bishop was bound to ask. He was not bound, however, to act on their advice except in cases expressly mentioned in the *jus Commune*. Benedict XIV. allows that the force of custom can free the bishop from being thus compelled to consult his chapter or to obtain their consent before exercising his legislative functions. On the other hand, since custom has the force of duly promulgated law, a chapter can acquire the right by custom of being consulted and of even giving their consent to episcopal constitutions on matters in which the *jus Commune* does not expressly require their advice or consent to be given.

Here we have two rulings of importance in mediæval canon law on the subject of diocesan synods; we at once begin to wonder whether they are binding on the Church at the present time. Since at the Reformation the Church accepted mediæval canon law except where it contravenes the law of the realm or the king's prerogative, it might be argued that these regulations about synodical government are still binding since they have never been repealed. Here, however, we must remember two things: in the first place the mediæval canon law is a collection of codes of varying authority. The *Decretum* of Gratian was a purely private compilation, and never possessed the authority of duly promulgated law in the Western Church; the same applies to the *Extravagantes* and the *Extravagantes Communes*, which received their present form at the hands of a Paris publisher, Jean Chapuis, in 1500. The Decretal of Gregory IX., the Sext and the Clementines, backed by the authority of papal Bulls, were the only codes of law regarded by the mediæval Church as of universal application.* These three codes alone have any claim on the obedience of English Churchmen.

Secondly, the Church is a dynamic rather than a static body; we cannot neglect the four hundred years which have elapsed between the Reformation and modern times. Though in this period the Church has seldom exercised her legislative functions, the law of the Church is not the same as it was at the beginning of the Reformation period. The law has been modified by the force of custom, which, provided it fulfils the conditions of *Rationabilis* and *Præscriptiva*, can repeal duly enacted law.† We have the authority of Benedict XIV.

* Tardif: *Histoire des Sources du Droit Canonique*, livre ix., chapitre ii.

† *Cf.* c. 9. x. 1. 4. Rationality means that the custom is not contrary to Divine or natural law, nor *contra decentiam et honestatem*. *Præscriptiva* is an adjective applied to custom which has been in existence for the number of years required to give it the force of law (see Suarez, *De Legibus Liber*, vii., cc. 6. 8. 13. 15).

for holding that the laws regarding the holding of diocesan synods are a sphere in which custom can validly operate. In the Church of England, therefore, the regulations of the mediæval canon law regarding diocesan synods have fallen into disuse. The Church is under no obligation to obey them. The modern revival of synodical government is free to develop *de novo*, as custom will direct, to meet the needs of the modern Church.

It is generally foolish, however, to neglect the wisdom of the past. Whatever form diocesan synods may eventually take, the Church would be wise to pay attention to those canonists, who have written on the theory and practice of synodical government. The two most important treatises are the *Tractatus de Synodo Episcopali* of Enrico de Botteo (commonly known as Bottæus), published in 1528,* and the *De Synodo Diocesana* of Benedict XIV., published in 1748.†

Bottæus (d. 1544) was a country clergyman, who spent all his life in two villages of Piedmont. He wrote his work, he tells us, in order to collect in a convenient whole all the information available on the subject of diocesan synods. It is the most exhaustive mediæval treatment of the subject. The treatise is divided into three parts: the first deals with the purpose of a synod and its uses; the second with its composition; and the third, by far the longest part, is a long discussion in the light of mediæval canon law on the business to be transacted in a synod and the extent of its powers. "In hoc ultimo," he tells us, "late ac utiliter Deo propitio, insistere est animus." Bottæus hardly deserves the obscurity into which he has fallen. He is clear, concise, and orderly in arrangement. Benedict XIV. paid him the compliment of borrowing his method of arrangement for his own treatise. He is, however, passed over in silence by the *Catholic Encyclopædia* and the *Dictionnaire Théologique Catholique*.

Benedict XIV. (b. 1675 at Bologna, Pope 1740-1758) is the greatest scholar amongst the Post-tridentine popes. As a canonist he is almost unrivalled; his *De Synodo Diocesana* has been described as the most important treatise on canon law since the Middle Ages. His Bulls and Constitutions are often important discussions on points of law; the *De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Beatorum Canonisatione* still remains the

* This work takes up some sixty pages in vol. xiii., p. 2, of the *Tractatus Universi Juris*, Venice, 1588.

† An abridged translation of this work was published by the Faith Press in 1926 under the title of *The Diocesan Synod*. Where references can be found in this work, it will be quoted under its English title. Otherwise all references are to the Latin edition, Benedict XIV., *Opera Omnia*, vol. xi., Edit. Prat., 1844.

great authority on canonization and heroic sanctity. He is of special interest to English people owing to his friendship with the exiled Stuarts and the admiration felt for him by Horace Walpole. He holds up Queen Elizabeth as an example to pious Catholics in her use of the Crucifix,* and quotes Jeremy Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium* as an authority in the *De Synodo Diocesana*. It is this latter work which is the classical treatise on synodical government. In the introduction we learn that he planned the treatise while Archbishop of Bologna (1731-1740). He was anxious to give synodical authority to certain edicts which he had issued for the government of his diocese. When he suggested holding a synod, he discovered that such confusion prevailed as to what exactly were the powers of a synod that he felt compelled to write his treatise first, in order to clarify the minds of his clergy on the subject, and to explain to them what a synod was meant to do. The synod was never held, since he was elected Pope at the next conclave. The treatise was only completed eight years later; it was written with great difficulty in what free time he could spare from the task of ruling the Church. For months at a time he was forced to leave it untouched. It is an enormous work, running to six hundred pages, and written in sonorous Ciceronian prose. From an historical point of view it is invaluable, but his conclusions have to be accepted with caution. In actual fact the real result of his work was not to popularize diocesan synods, but to put the coping stone on that process by which in the Church of Rome bishops have gradually become the administrative officials of the papacy.† It has been said that the *De Synodo Diocesana* made the Pope supreme in the realm of the law, as the Vatican Council of 1870 made him supreme in the sphere of faith and morals. Bottæus, on the other hand, leaves the bishop a comparatively free hand in the administration of his diocese, provided that he does not contravene the letter of the law. The different outlook of both the mediæval and Post-tridentine canonist is clearly seen in their views on the papacy. Bottæus declares (1. 18): "Papa volens facere ea quæ sunt contra universalem statum ecclesiæ, non est tolerandus." In the *Encyclical Magnæ Nobis* (Bull, 11. 51) Benedict XIV. tells the Bishops of Poland that "Romanus Pontifex est supra jus Commune."

We have now to see what information Bottæus and Benedict XIV. can give us about the purpose, usefulness, and composition of a synod. As to its purpose Bottæus quotes (1. 69) a mediæval cliché to the effect that the purpose of a synod

* Bull, 1. 141. 36.

† Schulte: *Geschichte des canonischen Rechts*, vol. iii., p. 506.

includes "Correctio, Judicium, Animadversio." He evidently does not think this very helpful, and tells us that in his opinion the object to be held in view in summoning a synod is the care of souls: the object incidentally of all canon law and Church government. He goes on to describe this purpose as fourfold (1. 70). A synod is the recognized means of informing the diocese of what has been already transacted in the provincial synod; the decrees of the latter are promulgated in the diocesan synod, and thereby become binding on the consciences of clergy and laity alike. The synod meets to make laws necessary for the government of the diocese, and to correct abuses. This is more conveniently done by the bishop and clergy acting in concert. It also provides a useful opportunity for the bishop to instruct the clergy on any subject which he may think necessary. This was very essential in Bottæus' day, he tells us, owing to the great ignorance of the clergy, and is often mentioned by later canonists as one of the advantages to be gained from summoning a synod. In canon law one of the chief duties of a bishop is to instruct his flock.

Benedict XIV. clearly states that the main object in holding a synod is legislation, the making of synodical constitutions, not discussion, or the passing of resolutions (vi. i. 1). These will aim at eradicating abuses, fostering all that is healthy in the life of the diocese, reforming the lives of the wicked, and restoring ecclesiastical discipline. The synod is the means by which the bishop legislates to meet the local needs of the diocese. It is not, however, necessary to make new constitutions in a synod; it is sufficient to renew the decrees of past general and provincial councils if these meet the needs of the diocese equally well. Benedict XIV., however, appears to weaken his argument by saying that synods are not absolutely necessary for the government of a diocese (*The Diocesan Synod*, pp. 16-19). His reasons are twofold. In the first place, circumstances often make it impossible to assemble the clergy in one spot. In this case he suggests that the bishop should consult his clergy in groups, and then publish his constitutions separately, without giving them synodical authority. Secondly, episcopal constitutions are equally binding on the consciences of the clergy and laity in the diocese, whether they are published in the synod or outside it, although they may lack the permanence of properly constituted law. Synodical constitutions differ too from ordinary episcopal edicts in the fact that they are more likely to meet the actual needs of the diocese, and more likely to be obeyed, since they have been drawn up with the advice of the clergy.

If, however, the chief purpose of a synod appears to be of

a legislative nature, it would appear to be useless, if the bishop can legislate more conveniently outside his synod. Benedict XIV. quotes an array of bishops and councils to shew that synods are useful, apart from their legislative functions (*The Diocesan Synod*, pp. 12-16; *cf.* vi. 1. 3-10). We will mention three of these in detail. Alexander VII., in his encyclical, *Inter Cætera*, addressed to the bishops of Italy (*Bull. Lux.*, vi. 20), says that nothing so furthers the salvation of nations and the maintenance of ancient discipline as a constant personal touch with souls and the assembling of synods; elsewhere in his encyclical (not quoted in the *De Synodo Diocesana*) the Pope thinks that legislation and the correction of abuses are likely to carry more weight if the bishop and clergy act together. Such action taken in common can claim an inspiration which is almost divine. He compares synodical government to good farming: if a farm is neglected weeds begin to appear; the neglect to hold diocesan synods leads to corruptions and abuses in the life of a diocese. A Council of Cologne in 1549 described diocesan synods as the nerves of the Church. When the holding of synods is neglected, ecclesiastical order begins to decay, in the same way as a human body when its nerves are destroyed. Augustinus Valerius, a famous bishop of Verona, said that when he saw his clergy before him in the synod, he saw his own eyes, ears, hands and feet. Through them he was able to learn about the real state of his diocese and legislate accordingly.

Benedict XIV. advises his readers to study for themselves the records of diocesan synods held by three famous bishops in the Post-tridentine Church—namely, those of St. Carlo Borromeo, St. Turribius of Lima, and Benedict XIII. while he was Archbishop of Beneventum. He sums up by saying that diocesan synods fulfil a threefold use: they keep the clergy up to their duties, they reform the lives of the laity, and act as a valuable prop of ecclesiastical discipline. We may conclude then that the value of a synod, in addition to its purely legislative functions, resides in the authority possessed by any measures which the bishop has taken in concert with his clergy; the bringing together of the clergy of the whole diocese stimulates keenness and enthusiasm, and the clergy themselves are able to give the bishop a real insight into the essential needs of the diocese which would be extremely hard for him otherwise to acquire. It is well to remember that an enthusiasm for synodical government can be urged as a claim to canonization on a bishop's behalf (*De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Beatorum Canonisatione*, liber iii., c. 34).

We have now to examine the views of Bottæus and Bene-

dict XIV. on the composition of a synod. From the earliest times all parish priests have been bound to attend, since synods dealt primarily with the salvation of souls (*The Diocesan Synod*, p. 69). In ancient records there is no mention of the presence in a synod of the canons of cathedral churches; Benedict XIV. tells us that even if summoned to a synod there was some doubt as to whether they were bound to attend. He comes to the conclusion they can only be compelled to attend when the synod is dealing with business in which they may be directly concerned: the saying of the Divine Office, the reform of clerical morals, and the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline (*The Diocesan Synod*, pp. 67-68). In the Mediæval Church there was a similar uncertainty as to the right of the bishop to compel the attendance at his synod of the unbeneficed clergy. In the Roman Church of the Post-tridentine period it has been decided that their attendance is not compulsory, except on the ground of custom (in this case the custom would have to have been in existence for ten years) or when the synod is dealing with matters which affect the whole body of the clergy. To avoid disputes on this subject Benedict XIV. advises the bishop to state in his summons to the unbeneficed clergy the object and purpose of the synod.

Canonists, however, tell us that certain circumstances justify non-attendance on the part of those who have been summoned. Bottæus* enumerates three just impediments which hinder attendance at a synod. They arise from the nature of the synod itself, the circumstances of the person who has been summoned, and the needs of the parish which he serves. No one is bound to attend a synod summoned for an unlawful purpose. Bottæus instances a synod held for the purpose of raising a rebellion against the Government. *Infirmitas*, *ætas*, *necessitas* on the part of the person summoned also excuse attendance. Infirmitas can only be understood as serious illness. Bottæus instances the quartan ague or the plague; a doctor's certificate must be produced to shew that the illness is genuine. Benedict XIV. (*Institutio*, cvii.) says that an illness can only excuse the fulfilment of a canonical obligation when it prevents the patient from attending a social function at night. Necessitas includes such circumstances as family bereavement and the impossibility of travelling owing to bad weather. A priest is also excused attendance if he is unable to provide for the services of his parish while away at the synod. He adds, however, that the clergy should make sincere efforts to overcome these difficulties. Benedict XIV. repeats the impediments mentioned by Bottæus; he adds, however, that those clergy who fail to

* *Tractatus de Synodo Episcopali*, II. 56 ff.

fulfil the obligation of attending a synod because they have no one to leave in their parishes are to be commended rather than blamed.

On the subject of the composition of a synod it appears that both Bottæus and Benedict XIV. think that everyone ought to be present in the synod who is concerned in the business which is being transacted there; they come in order that the bishop may hear their opinions before coming to a decision himself. If the synod is only dealing with one section of the clergy the rest need not attend, for they will not be affected by any subsequent action which the synod may take. Attendance at a synod is based on a clearly defined principle that all are bound to attend who are concerned in its deliberations.

This will help us in estimating both Bottæus' and Benedict XIV.'s treatment of the laity's attendance at a synod. Bottæus* distinguishes between a synod dealing with matters which concern the clergy and the reform of clerical morals and a synod which is summoned to promulgate the statutes of a provincial synod, and to deal with matters which concern the laity. In the latter case the laity ought to attend. In this he follows the authority of Nicholas de Tudeschis (commonly known as Panormitanus), but their functions in the synod are limited to that of spectators: they may not give their opinion or speak on any subject under discussion. Benedict XIV. (*The Diocesan Synod*, pp. 75-84), after a lengthy treatment of the whole subject, comes to the following conclusions: it was originally the custom for the laity to be present at diocesan synods, but in his day the custom had become obsolete. It was a disputed point amongst canonists as to whether the bishop any longer had the power to invite the laity to his synod, even if he wished to do so. The laity can no longer claim to be present at a synod by right, nor can they be invited because the bishops wish to consult them, since this can be done equally well outside. Two reasons alone justify their attendance: a grave and urgent cause and the force of custom. By the latter they can acquire a legal right to attend. The chief objection in the past to their presence in a synod was due to the fact that synods generally dealt with scandals in the lives of the clergy which it was thought unedifying for the laity to hear.

These conclusions are extremely interesting in view of the fact that in the modern Roman Church the laity have no voice in the management of ecclesiastical affairs. There is nothing, therefore, in the nature of a synod to make the attendance of the laity improper: in the course of history synods have become

* *Tractatus de Synodo Episcopali*, II. 33-34.

confined to the clergy because they usually dealt with matters which only concerned the clergy. If synods once more become the means by which the bishop deals with the affairs of the whole diocese there is nothing intrinsically wrong in the attendance of the laity. In fact, that attendance should become eminently desirable in view of the principle which we have seen underlies the composition of a diocesan synod, namely, that all should be present who are concerned in its deliberations.

It might be urged that modern conditions, the ease with which a bishop can communicate with his clergy, the existence of diocesan conferences, make the holding of synods unnecessary. This is a criticism beside the point. One of the most pressing problems with which the Anglican Church is confronted is the lack of uniformity: the fact that in no two parishes are the services conducted in the same way, or the same methods pursued in teaching the Faith and the saving of souls. Such a problem is outside the province of a diocesan conference, and a bishop could not tackle it alone with any hope of success. If synodical government became the rule in every diocese, constitutions could be drawn up by the bishop with the advice of his synod, laying down the way, for instance, in which the Eucharist is to be celebrated in every church, the method to be used in the training of confirmation candidates, and the organizing of Sunday schools. The synod would issue organized schemes of instruction on the Faith for the whole diocese, and lay down the main lines on which pastoral work is to be carried on; no longer would these things be left to the individual whims and prejudices of each incumbent. Since these constitutions would be representative of the opinion of the whole diocese (for, as we have seen, there is nothing to prevent the presence of the leading laity), they would be likely to secure a considerable measure of support from all parishes in the diocese. It is thus by the revival of synodical government that an end could be put to our unhappy divisions, and with a united front the Church would be able to pursue her task of saving the souls of men.

G. ADDLESHAW.

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY HIGH CHURCHMAN, 1685–1740

I

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY Anglicanism has fared hardly at the hands of historians, both Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic. Both parties have deplored its general lack of enthusiasm and its cold moralism;* and even Broad Churchmen, who might possibly be expected to be most at home in an "age of reason," have joined to make this condemnation unanimous.† That this verdict is a substantially true one seems beyond reasonable doubt, but none the less it needs to be recalled that not all the Hanoverian clergy were lacking zeal, and that there was a tradition of catholic practice, attenuated no doubt, and further weakened by the secession of the non-jurors, but, even so, by no means contemptible.

This tradition of pre-Tractarian Anglo-Catholicism, if we may so call it, was at least sufficiently strong to have left an unself-conscious record in the literature of the time. For instance there was old Parson Cole, who when exploring the churches of Paris took note of all the altars and tabernacles,‡ and was indeed, as Horace Walpole said, "as true a Roman Catholic as it is possible for a Protestant clergyman to be, and there is but a very nice distinction between them, especially when they are antiquaries."§ In fiction, Roderick Random came across a ship's chaplain who, supposing him to be at the point of death, wished to confess him,‖ and even Tom Jones's objectionable tutor Thwackum had severe notions about those separated from the true Church by infidelity, heresy, or schism.¶

II

In fact there is a good deal of evidence that the tradition of Catholic Anglicanism reflected in Walton's *Lives* and John Evelyn's diary formed a regular though unobtrusive part of the

* R. Balleine: *History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England* (1933), chapter ii., and 208; C. P. S. Clarke: *Oxford Movement and After* (1932), chapter v.; and in *Northern Catholicism* (1933), 1, and many other writers. But *cf.* L. G. Wickham Legg: *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* (1914), *passim*; and specially N. Sykes: "Episcopal Administration in the Eighteenth Century," *English Historical Review*, xlvii. (1932), 414-446.

† M. Pattison in *Essays and Reviews* (1861), 254.

‡ Cole: *Paris Journal* (1765), ed. F. G. Stokes (1931); *cf.* 133.

§ H. Walpole: *Letters*, ed. Toynbee, viii. (1904), 55.

‖ Smollett: *Roderick Random* (pub. 1748), chapter xxxiv.

¶ Fielding: *Tom Jones* (pub. 1749), book iii., chapter iii.

Englishman's ecclesiastical environment. It is the purpose of this essay to give an account of this old-fashioned orthodoxy as it is represented in an undoubtedly estimable but relatively obscure parson of a country town—"Old Mr. Cart of Leicester," as he appears commonly to have been described. Samuel Carte, after being a country vicar for some years at Clifton upon Dunsmoor in Warwickshire, established himself, after disputing with a rival claimant, in 1699 as vicar of St. Martin's, the principal parish of Leicester.* Carte was an assiduous antiquary, and like most antiquaries, as Horace Walpole noticed, a High Churchman. He was not a figure of national renown, like Hoadley and Waterland, but of a respectable reputation in learned society. Like his more famous son, the historian, Thomas Carte, he was sufficiently important to be noticed by Hearne,† but neither was sufficiently outstanding for Hearne not to confuse father and son.‡ In Leicester Samuel Carte divided his time between parochial business and investigating local antiquities. Although he found the isolation of a small country town in an age of bad roads extremely inconvenient—"my searches into antiquity," he complained, "are very imperfect for want of proper books in this place"§—he none the less succeeded in compiling several lists of abbots, prelates and monasteries,‖ added considerably to the local history of Roman and medieval Leicester,¶ and died in 1740, being commemorated by having a narrow lane in the centre of the town named after him.

The character of Carte's theological views we are fortunate in being able to discover from the papers relating to him preserved by his son Thomas, now kept as the "Carte Papers" in the Bodleian. He was very definitely an adherent of the "Church party,"** and his surviving letters are not friendly to heretical divines like Hoadley. Moreover, according to the standards of the time, he was a Ritualist. In 1685, while he was still a country vicar in Warwickshire, he defended to his parishioners his wearing a surplice to preach in at morning service, much as any nineteenth-century Puseyite might have done. It was the law of the Church, he said, to read Matins

* See *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, ix., sub. CARTE, Samuel. A much better account in C. J. Billson, *Leicester Memoirs* (1924), 131.

† Hearne: *Collections*, vii., 341.

‡ *Ibid.*, 22.

§ Bodl. MS. Carte, 199, f. 265: Samuel Carte to Thomas Carte, November 14, 1724. He complained to Browne Willis in 1715 that "there being few that are lovers of antiquities, your books have not reached this place." Bodl. MS. Willis, xlviii., f. 363.

‖ Mentioned in Hearne, *op. cit.*, vii., 341.

¶ C. J. Billson, *loc. cit.*

** MS. Carte, 244, f. 101. He was well informed about the politics of Convocation, *ibid.*, ff. 109-177.

in a surplice, and convenient to preach in it, as the prayer for Christ's Church militant followed the sermon. However, to avoid scandal, he consented to preach in a gown, under protest.* For, in words that are particularly interesting as being spoken at the time when James II. was using his influence to destroy the power of the Church of England, he said:

> "I do conform to the Church of England, not merely out of interest, but out of judgment, and from my experience, approving her orders as good . . . and though (if the information I have received be true) this may be against my interest, yet I will declare it again, that I believe the Church of England to be the best constituted Church in the world, and do highly reverence and esteem of all her appointments."†

Still more interesting from our point of view is a sermon, apparently of about the same date, preached on the Eucharist.‡ It is very fortunate that a full text of this survives, as it no doubt is typical of the kind of teaching given at this time from the great majority of Anglican pulpits up and down the country. This time again Carte is concerned to explain why he behaves in a particular way in church. "I would not only be satisfied in myself in what I doe, but I would also satisfye you likewise," is his address to his parishioners, "that whatever alterations I make in the customs of the place, is grounded upon mature deliberation and consideration, and especially in so great a solemnity as this." The point at issue now is not such a comparatively small matter as the wearing of a surplice at the sermon, but, more important, the grounds and motives that induced him

> "to order the celebration of the holy communion to be, not in the body of the church, but in the chancel."

Apparently, this was not an uncommon question at this time, and it was the practice of High Church patrons of livings, like the Earls of Huntingdon, on appointing to benefices, to demand of prospective incumbents a written promise to celebrate the Holy Communion "at the Communion Table placed Alterwise,"§ and not in any other manner.

Carte's explanation of his practice went to the roots of

* *Cf.* Wickham Legg, *op. cit.*, 377.

† MS. Carte, 244, ff. 84-85, dated December, 1685, the notes of an address.

‡ *Ibid.*, f. 82.

§ *Ibid.*, 78, f. 48, promise of Joseph Cradock to be rector of Markfield; f. 47, a promise of Theophilus Brookes, on being instituted to the same living, "to performe it (*i.e.*, the Holy Communion Service) at the Communion Table, as well when there is no Sacrament as when there is, and that when and as often as I preach and read prayers at the same time. . . . I will preach in my surplice, and read the prayers at the Communion Table on those days the Church directs." Dated July 23, 1690. *Cf.* Wickham Legg, *op. cit.*, 119, 75-76.

the matter, and throws considerable light on his theological outlook. His reasons were four.

The first is that the rule of doing all things decently and in order,

> "though it ought to be observed in every part of the worship of God, yet ought most exactly to be followed in our solemnizing the blessed Eucharist. . . . Now seeing this is the most mysterious rite of our religion, seeing in it we have more immediate communion with the great God and our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, seeing it has an eminent holiness above all other acts of religious worship, therefore it is most agreeable to its nature and transcendent excellency that it should be celebrated in a peculiar place . . . [and that] . . . to the Eucharist in the Chancel, none may come but such as have actually engaged themselves to be the disciples of Christ."

To celebrate the Eucharist in the chancel is thus to declare its pre-eminent dignity as the highest act of Christian worship.

Further, Carte understood the sacrament to be a sacrament of unity. It represents the unity of Christian people, eating of one Bread and drinking of one Cup, and therefore, he argued, those assembled for its celebration should not be dispersed irregularly over a large church, but should be gathered together in one place in the chancel. In the third place,

> "as this is a sacrament of union among ourselves who are to partake of it, so is it also of our union with the Catholick church, which is the body of Christ, and therefore it is most agreeable to the nature of it, to conform ourselves to her practice, which was in all ages to celebrate it in the chancel, and this reason too is enforct with the authority of our government."

For the fourth reason in defence of his practice Carte turned to the thought of the commemoration of Christ's Sacrifice:

> "In this blessed Sacrament is represented the Crucifixion and passion of our dearest Lord, as the Apostle observes, Gal. 3, 1. All the actions, the ordering of bread and wine, the taking them and consecrating them, the breaking of the one and the pouring out of the other, are matters that every one that will duly partake of this sacrament should observe and meditate as being significative of Christ's designation to be sacrificed for our sins."

Thus, by celebrating in the chancel men will be better able to see the "manual acts," and so to meditate on Christ's Death and Passion.

Carte's attitude to the Holy Sacrament is thus one of great devotion. And so, in his peroration, he reminds his people of its great benefits. As

> "in this sacrament we are made partakers of the greatest blessings that ever God vouchsafed to mankind, yea greater than he gave to angels,

it is fit that we do something to express our desire of receiving it, and therefore I shall require you to come to the place appointed to receive it, and as our blessed Saviour (whose minister I am) said, Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden and I will refresh you, he offers refreshment, but it is to those that come, so shall I be ready to administer this comfortable refreshing sacrament, but I shall require you to signify your desire of it by coming."

He gave way about the surplice, a point indifferent, but would not give way to irreverence.

The line taken by Carte in this sermon in treating of the Eucharist as a representation of Christ's Passion is to consider it chiefly as a manward representation of God's mercy, rather than as a Godward pleading of the Holy Sacrifice, more or less after the style of Waterland.* On the other hand, a concluding reference about the Lord as "now interceding for us in Heaven" suggests that he may have been exercising reserve in the communication of religious knowledge. Whether this is so or not, in 1724 his Eucharistic theology was sufficiently developed for him to write to his son Thomas in warm praise of a Roman Catholic work on the Eucharist, of which he does not, unfortunately, mention either title or author, and to declare that

"I have read it and admire the accuracy of the performance and the singular ingenuity of the author, and hope that it will be translated into English. One thing more especially surprizes me, and that is the explication given of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, which seems to me the same with that of our orthodox divines, but how such as admit of that explication can allow themselves to adore the Host in such manner as they do, is a great mystery to me."†

The phrase about the adoration of the Host "in such manner as they do" is reminiscent of Thorndike,‡ a writer whose work the Cartes, both father and son, must have studied.

III

But it is not as a teacher of the Anglican tradition either of ceremonial or of Eucharistic doctrine that Carte has received any attention from historians, or any great local reputation in Leicester, although it would not be rash to suggest that his high sacramental doctrine, even in an important church like St. Martin's, had its effect in regular care for the altar and the vessels and linen used in the celebration of the Blessed Sacrament.§ Carte's notice in history has been due, apart from his

* *Cf.* Darwell Stone: *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, ii. (1909), 501-506.

† MS. Carte, 100, f. 265: S. to T. Carte, November 14, 1724.

‡ Darwell Stone, *op. cit.*, ii., 353.

§ MS. Vestry Book, Leicester Cathedral, No. 19. The accounts of 1700, soon after Carte's arrival, indicate a thorough cleaning of the Communion linen and plate.

importance as an antiquary, to the share he had in the Trinitarian controversy, a local eddy of which added yet another to the petty agitations of the eighteenth-century country town, of which he was the principal minister. In this dispute, besides Carte and his heretical antagonist John Jackson, there are two other parties whose behaviour it is interesting to observe, Edmund Gibson, then Bishop of Lincoln, and the Corporation of Leicester.

Gibson came to Lincoln as Bishop in 1716, and Jackson to Leicester as confrater of Wigston's Hospital, an ancient almshouse, in 1719: and the two main crises of the dispute in Leicester occurred, the first under Gibson's rule as bishop, in 1719-1721, and the second, after he had been translated to London some five years, in 1729.

It was thus only with the first stage of the quarrel between Jackson and Carte that Gibson was concerned, and then only in the last year or two of his episcopate. Samuel Carte's bosom friend, confidant, and retailer to him of all the London news and gossip, Montagu Wood, rector of St. Martin Vintry, in the City, and prebendary of Wells,* made the interesting and quotable comment that he

> "should think him pretty well affected to the Church, but the great expectation he has of an uncle who is a physician and a dissenter, make him a little more a Whig, than otherwise he would be "†

—a shrewd enough judgment well borne out by the relations of Gibson with Walpole.‡ In general, Gibson earned the reputation of caution, moderation, and good sense, and succeeded in combining whiggishness with orthodoxy. Being more of a legal than of a theological turn of mind, he did not take a heated and prominent part in the quarrel of Athanasians and Arians, and it suited his character that the issue for him to settle in Leicester was legal, though its ultimate ground theological, so that he could lay aside his Athanasian sympathies and call to order both parties, orthodox and "Arian," on the legal ground.

The origin of the quarrel that Gibson did his best to settle may be found as far back as 1717 in the appointment by the Duchy of Lancaster to the mastership of Wigston's Hospital of no other person than Samuel Clarke, the notable Arian controversialist.§ This was an unwelcome appointment to the orthodox, but Clarke's conduct was judicious.‖ But in 1719

* Venn. *Alumni Cantab.*

† MS. Carte, 239, f. 462: M. Wood to S. Carte, February 6, 1719/20.

‡ N. Sykes: *Edmund Gibson* (1929), and especially the same author in *English Historical Review*, xliv. (1929), 628-632.

§ On whom see *Dict. Nat. Biog.*; also Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (1902), 205-212.

‖ MS. Carte, 244, f. 115, according to Wood, writing to Carte, March 21, 1717/18.

Clarke secured the appointment to the confratership of John Jackson, a Greek scholar, who had abandoned Athanasian views on reading the polemical dissertations of Clarke.*

No more than Carte was Jackson a great man, though he may have had a greater store of theological erudition. He wrote a number of pamphlets against Waterland in the Arian controversy, though he hardly attained the highest eminence among the controversialists.† He was by no means without amiability, and Cradock, a local *littérateur*, speaks of the confrater's benevolent interest in his early education.‡ Being a man of learning, he formed for himself a party in the town, and gained a certain support among the dissenters. So far removed was he from the strict churchmanship of Carte and the Corporation that he caused scandal by going in his canonical habit, publicly, to a conventicle, and there openly complimenting the preacher.§ Wood, writing from his London parish, said of this that

> "his going to a meeting would have been a scandal to him before, but is certainly much more now. Even here, where more liberty is taken with less offence I cannot say that any of our clergy ever went to those places." ‖

In general, Jackson seems to have been a disciple of Clarke. Like his master, he defended the orthodox practice of infant baptism against Whiston, but in general the views of neither Jackson nor Clarke agreed with those of St. Martin's pulpit.¶

The first quarrel arose about the duties of Jackson as confrater of the Hospital. As confrater, Jackson was afternoon lecturer, under a sixteenth-century endowment of the Earl of Huntingdon, at St. Martin's Church. Under the strict terms of the endowment Jackson should have preached every Sunday

* Whiston: *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Rev. Mr. Jackson* (1746), 5, 11, 14.

† Although he was once referred to by Montagu Wood as chief adversary of Dr. Waterland. MS. Carte, 239, f. 471: M. Wood to S. Carte, June 3, 1721. He was certainly a prolific pamphleteer.

‡ J. Cradock: *Literary Memoirs*, i. (1823), 3.

§ MS. Carte, 117, f. 47: Draft letter of S. Carte to the Bishop of Lincoln, November 21, 1729.

‖ *Ibid.*, 239, f. 492: M. Wood to S. Carte, November 6, 1729.

¶ *E.g.*, John Jackson's *Existence and Unity of God, a Vindication of Dr. Clarke's Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God* (1734), might easily be taken as undermining Athanasian faith: the work is much more one of philosophy than of theology. This school denied that they were Arians: but their interest in the attributes of *Deus Philosophorum* and an excessive insistence on the mediatorial office of the Christ laid them open to this charge. See *A Full Account of Dr. Clarke's Proceedings* (1714), especially 32, where Clarke denies omitting the Athanasian creed and the third and fourth petitions of the Litany. Lecky regards this school as Semi-Arian, and gives a lucid summary account of the progress of the dispute in his famous chapter on Methodism, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, ii. (1878), 536-543. *Cf.* Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (1902), 205-212.

and every Wednesday and Friday, or two other weekdays, but by agreement of the Corporation and parish the lecturer was excused lecturing on the weekdays, and one Sunday sermon only was exacted.* As a lecturer, it was held that, according to the Act of Uniformity, he ought to give monthly assent and consent to the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles of Religion. This meant, of course, that he had to declare his agreement with the three Creeds and a number of Athanasian collects. Jackson was awkward. When he was required to preach and give assent and consent, he refused to appear—although the churchwardens warned him of his duty—and held a rival service at the Hospital, where, according to Carte, on the Whitsunday of 1720,

"after reading the service (in doing which he omitted both the Athanasian creed and the collect for the day), he closed the book and said, I here declare my assent and consent to these prayers and all contained in this book. But this could not be said to be done openly, the Hospital door being locked or bolted, nor was it done in the words prescribed by the Act, nor in the time and place appointed."†

Moreover, when Jackson did preach, he preached heresy.

On both the points of discipline and of heresy Gibson took a characteristic line. On the heresy he made the commonsense remark to be expected of him, that Jackson

"ought to content himself with declaring his sentiments concerning the point in dispute in print, and not to trouble a mix'd congregation with anything but plain practical doctrine."‡

On the point of discipline he was admirably impartial and cautious, and did not allow himself to be stampeded into any indiscretion by the frequent letters of complaint written by Carte to him about this, that, or the other tiresome practice of Jackson. First, the Bishop, doubtful of his jurisdiction in the Hospital, merely enjoined Jackson to read prayers and to give assent and consent once a month, and to preach a sermon the first Sunday of the month—which admonition the Bishop hoped "may make him more cautious of giving offence."§ Then, discovering that Carte himself was a lecturer within the meaning of the Act (for he received a pension from the Corpora-

* MS. Carte, 100, f. 457; P.R.O. DL 5/43, f. 534.

† *Ibid.*, 239, f. 135: S. Carte to Bishop (Gibson) of Lincoln, January 15, 1720/21. Throsby notes Jackson's defence of his practice: that the Statutes of the Hospital only provided for the reading of the Apostles' Creed, nor had master and confrater to subscribe to any articles of religion: *History of Leicester* (1792), 185, note (*a*).

‡ *Ibid.*, 242, f. 130: Bishop of Lincoln to S. Carte, August 27, 1720.

§ *Ibid.*, f. 138: Bishop of Lincoln to S. Carte, March 11, 1720/21.

tion as a lecturer),* the Bishop ordered Carte to give monthly assent and consent, a ruling that greatly pleased Jackson, who crowed over Carte,† and greatly annoyed Carte, who complained to the Bishop that "the requiring of me to do the same would put me upon the purgation of the crime with him, which I do not labour under possession of."‡ Again, two months later, in June, 1721, Carte wrote complaining to the Bishop of an Arian sermon of Jackson's,§ but was not very warmly received. The Bishop told Carte that Jackson's objection to giving assent and consent was not of doctrinal scruple, but being forced to do it—a weak enough point—and that, as regarded the behaviour in the pulpit, he knew the law.‖ So Carte was given a plain hint not to bother the Bishop too much.

Finally, in 1721, proceedings were launched against Jackson at the Archdeacon's visitation, and by order of the Bishop in the consistory of the Vicar-General.¶ The presentment made by the churchwardens against Jackson must have been a formidable document, for it moved even the Bishop, for all his insistence that proceedings must be judicially impartial, to declare that "in truth such open and barefast insults upon our constitution are not to be endured."** Whiston asserts that the articles in this presentment contained a great deal of untruth, for instance that Jackson was charged with false teaching at St. Martin's, Leicester, in the morning of a day when actually it was proved that in the afternoon of the same day he preached in St. James's, Westminster, of which church Clarke was vicar.†† For the time being Gibson's tact suggested a way out. Jackson was informed by a legal opinion that he was not a lecturer under the terms of the Act,‡‡ although he had actually been licensed by the Bishop to lecture in St. Martin's,§§ and so now the Bishop, not knowing "what to recommend by way of defence," suggested that, as a *modus vivendi*, Carte and Jackson should arrange to read prayers, and give assent and consent, on alternate first Sundays,‖‖ a compromise which seems to have been adopted.

* MS. Carte, 117, f. 441: S. to T. Carte, August, 1713, complaining that Corporation has not increased his pension. Increase granted: Leicester Corporation MS. Hall Minutes, September 25, 1713.

† *Ibid.*,, 242, f. 154: Jackson to S. Carte, July 3, 1721.

‡ *Ibid.*, f. 148: S. Carte to Bishop of Lincoln, April 15, 1721.

§ *Ibid.*, f. 150: S. Carte to Bishop of Lincoln, June 15, 1721.

‖ *Ibid.*, f. 151: Bishop of Lincoln to S. Carte, June 15, 1721.

¶ Leicester Cathedral MS. Vestry Book, 19, January 3, 1721/22.

** MS. Carte, 242, f. 157: Bishop of Lincoln to S. Carte, July 29, 1721.

†† Whiston, *op. cit.*, 61.

‡‡ MS. Carte, 242, f. 161, November 17, 1721; 239, f. 473: M. Wood to S. Carte, November 28, 1721.

§§ *Ibid.*, 242, *loc. cit.*, and 239, f. 471: M. Wood to S. Carte, June 3, 1721.

‖‖ *Ibid.*, 242, f. 161. On the back of this letter is a note saying that Jackson and Carte had agreed to do as the Bishop suggested.

There, for the present, matters stood. Carte was stiff and unrelenting, and Jackson felt that the reading prayers and declaring assent once a month was an imposition,* though earlier he had expressed willingness to obey the law.† Neither would give way. Of the actual proceedings in the Archdeacon's court all that can be gathered from the correspondence of Carte and Wood is that a method of prosecution having been discovered,‡ the orthodox cause prospered§—but not for long, for Jackson succeeded in defeating his opponents.‖

The Corporation had loyally supported Carte in this conflict, in virtue of its share in the management of the Huntingdon Lecture. Its consistent orthodoxy had evoked the admiration of Montagu Wood.¶ Now in 1724, through the Corporation, the orthodox front was strengthened by the generosity of the Earl of Coningsby, who conveyed to a body of trustees, consisting of the five senior members of the Corporation and seven local clergymen, an annuity of 12 guineas a year, to endow twelve sermons, to be preached one Sunday every month, and always on Trinity Sunday, in vindication of Catholic orthodoxy.** So Samuel Carte, in the same letter in which he spoke highly of the Roman Catholic book on the Eucharist, told his son Thomas about Coningsby's foundation, and asked him, should he "meet with any discourse well wrote upon that subject," to send it to him in Leicester.†† With Carte making good use of the Coningsby Lecture, there was at least for a time a belligerent neutrality, an armed peace, and in 1724 Wood congratulated Carte that "your Mr. Jackson is not so troublesome as he used to be."‡‡

But in 1729 trouble broke out again, Jackson having succeeded Clarke as master of Wigston's Hospital.§§ Now that it was not his office as master to preach, he insisted on preaching, and was forcibly excluded by the churchwardens from the pulpit of St. Martin's.‖‖ So again Carte fell to his usual relief of composing long letters of detailed complaint about Jackson. The root of the matter was that Jackson held that the master could exact absolute obedience from the confrater, and that Hacket, the confrater, himself apparently orthodox enough, was com-

* MS. Carte, f. 154: Jackson to S. Carte, July 3, 1721.
† *Ibid.*, f. 143: Bishop to S. Carte, March 17, 1720/21.
‡ *Ibid.*, 239, f. 473: M. Wood to S. Carte, November 28, 1721.
§ *Ibid.*, f. 479: M. Wood to S. Carte, May 5, 1722.
‖ Nichols, *History and Antiquities of Leicestershire*, i., 498.
¶ *Ibid.*, 239, f. 474: M. Wood to S. Carte, October 17, 1721.
** Leicester Corporation Muniments, Press 22: Tripartate Indenture between (i.) Thomas Ayre, Mayor of Leicester, and four J.P.'s; (ii.) seven local vicars, including John Carte, vicar of Hinckley; (iii.) Samuel Carte.
†† MS. Carte, 100, f. 265.
‡‡ *Ibid.*, 239, f. 484: M. Wood to S. Carte, November 5, 1724.
§§ P.R.O., DL 5/43, f. 490, a note of the appointment.
‖‖ Whiston, *op. cit.*, 101.

pletely under Jackson's thumb. Carte had to make Hacket promise not to give up the afternoon lecture to Jackson "without sufficient notice to the Mayor." Whereupon Jackson wrote demanding the right to dispose absolutely of the pulpit on Sunday afternoons. This demand Carte naturally refused, saying that his pulpit "should be open to Mr. Hacket or any of his friends, except Mr. Jackson, Mr. Wiston and Mr. Wolstan." Jackson's reply was to keep Hacket to hold a rival service at the Hospital,* which stood at the west side of the churchyard, and at St. Martin's the congregation waited, while "the clerk was ordered, and did call aloud, Mr. Philip Hacket, come and do your duty, and he not appearing the congregation departed."† The parishioners were "destitute of a sermon for two months and more."‡

The contest having reached so undignified a stage of noisiness, there was nothing for it but to take legal measures to restrain the master and compel the confrater to do his duty. The churchwardens petitioned the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, as Visitor of Wigston's Hospital, to secure that either Hacket preached or a deputy approved by the vicar. And in a postscript it was set forth finally that ". . . preaching is no part of the office belonging to the master of Wigston's Hospital . . ." and that Jackson, "when he did preach as confrater, . . . often vented in the pulpit several heterodox notions repugnant to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, to the offence of several of his orthodox hearers."§ The agitation was supported by influential people. The Mayor was present at a vestry meeting called to discuss the petition,‖ and the parish sought and obtained the zealous assistance of the Earl of Huntingdon.¶ The parish was successful in its cause, the Duchy court ordering Hacket to preach as required, unless hindered by the vicar.** The bells of the church were rung to celebrate this "casting Mr. Jackson in the Duchy Chamber." The parish was evidently equally successful on the doctrinal issue, for the bells were rung again in celebration of a successful appeal to the court of the Arches against Jackson.†† The evident gratification of the parish enlivens even the baldness of the parochial vestry book.

* MS. Carte, 117, f. 447: Draft of letter to Bishop of Lincoln dated November 21, 1730. *Ibid.*, f. 457: Petition to Chancellor of Duchy of Lancaster, signed by churchwardens, Gabriel Newton and Jno. Cartwright.

† *Ibid.*, f. 448: Another draft of letter on same subject.

‡ P.R.O., *loc. cit.*, f. 534

§ MS. Carte, *loc. cit.*, f. 458.

‖ Leicester Cathedral, *loc. cit.*, November 2, 1731.

¶ *Ibid.*, November 2, 1731.

** P.R.O., *loc. cit.*, f. 534.

†† Leicester Cathedral, *loc. cit.*: Account of Gabriel Newton and Samuel Brown, churchwardens for the year 1731.

IV

Opposed to Jackson in theology, Carte was not less opposed to him in politics. For while Jackson was a Whig latitudinarian, and ready to take part in any movement to discredit the Tory Corporation of Leicester with the central government, as he did with zeal in a Jacobite scare of 1736,* Carte, on the other hand, was a high Tory as well as being a High Churchman. In fact this seems to have been a mark of the family. The accession of George I. to the throne created a fresh company of non-jurors, of whom Thomas Carte was one.† The worthy Samuel Carte, his father, was so high Tory as not to be free from suspicion, and Gibson, with extraordinary tact, was careful to enquire of him about prayers for the King:

"namely, whether the person employed by you to read prayers in the church has any irregularities in his manner of reading prayers for the Royal family, and whether when he preaches he prays for the King and the Royal Family."‡

John Carte, another learned son of Samuel Carte, afterwards vicar of Hinckley,§ was very perturbed about the whole business. In 1715 he wrote to Montagu Wood, his father's London friend, to ask him about the practice of the London clergy in praying for the King, and Wood, discussing the matter with Samuel Carte, expressed regret that some of the clergy had scruples, as very few people, either clerical or lay, wanted another revolution.‖ Again, in 1719 John got very worried about the particular questioning of the Archdeacon, "whether the minister pray for KG by name."¶ Indeed, Macaulay would have regarded all the Cartes, father and sons, as being as credulous as he did Bishop Ken about the person of kings, and no doubt they would have been gratified at the comparison. For Thomas Carte created a mild stir by his published belief in touching for the King's evil.** As good Tories, moreover, the Cartes had

* *Faction Unmasked* (1738), a common pamphlet. There is a copy in MS. Carte, 114, f. 469. *Cf.* Jackson's sermon preached before Colonel Churchill's regiment of dragoons at their camp near Leicester, August 1, 1723, "The Duty of Subjects towards their Governors"; denies that any particular form of government, such as monarchy, is alone of divine appointment; "all Civil Power is *originally* founded in the Agreement and Consent of the People."

† Lathbury: *The Non-Jurors.* For some account of Thomas Carte's political notions see *English Historical Review*, xlviii. (1933), 630-638.

‡ MS. Carte, 242, f. 138: Gibson to S. Carte, March 11, 1720/21.

§ For a lively account of this priest see Nichols, *History*, iv., part ii., 744.

‖ MS. Carte, 244, f. 102: M. Wood to S. Carte, October 21, 1715. Also *ibid.*, f. 163: J. to S. Carte, November 2, 1715: "We are in great concern about the new prayers."

¶ *Ibid.*, f. 156: J. to S. Carte, May 4, 1719.

** Actually referred to by Macaulay, *History of England* (ed. Firth), iv., 1744, note i. *Cf.* Lecky, *op. cit.*, i., 63-73; reference to T. Carte and other High Church and Jacobite historians, 72.

the veneration for Charles I., the royal martyr, that was characteristic of their type. Thomas Carte wrote a work of great learning in vindication of Charles I.'s part in the Irish rebellion,* and his father greatly pleased him by expressing great approval of it, and by seeing it through the press.†

But if Jackson and Carte could agree neither about theology nor politics, they both shared a common regard for education, though the education most admired by Carte would perhaps hardly have been appreciated by Jackson in all its details. Carte's ideal was that of the S.P.C.K., which had been founded in 1698, having for its chief object the foundation of "catechetical schools," at first principally in London and Westminster.‡ Of this society Carte became the local secretary.§ The usual curriculum of these schools was the three R's, together with the principles of religion as contained in the Catechism and Prayer Book. The teaching in the S.P.C.K. schools was so definitely Anglican as to be condemned as Jacobite propaganda, emphasis being laid on "the doctrine of the cross."‖ The system of education had nothing democratic in it, though it was admired as a means by which exceptionally clever boys might rise above poverty. Normally, great emphasis was laid on the vocational aspect of education, to "inure the children of the poor to industry and labour."¶ Apologists for these schools, like the comfortable Dean Tucker, had no difficulty in showing that there was no danger of their raising the poor above their station, and unfitting them for "those servile offices which are necessary in all communities, and for which the wise Governor of this World has by his Providence designed them."**

No parochial school of this type was founded in Leicester during Carte's lifetime, the first being organized by the Evangelical Thomas Robinson in St. Mary's parish in 1785.†† But there were various endowed schools started in the town during Carte's lifetime which obviously owe their inspiration to the S.P.C.K. ideals of the High Churchmen. For instance, about 1714 a school was founded by one Matthew Symons for the clothing and education of twelve poor boys, to "learn to read, and be instructed in the principalls of the Christian Protestant Religion,"

* Hearne, *ibid.*, x., 471, a pamphlet expanded in his *Life of James, Duke of Ormonde* (1736).

† MS. Carte, 244, f. 162: T. to S. Carte, May 24, 1714.

‡ Allen and McClure: *Two Hundred Years, the History of S.P.C.K.*, 1698-1898, 136.

§ McClure: *A Chapter in English Church History* (1888), 176, 193, 273.

‖ See *Account* of S.P.C.K. of 1768, 68-69.

¶ *Account* of S.P.C.K. (1761), 34.

** *Ibid.*, 66. *Cf.* Frank Smith, *History of English Elementary Education*, 1760-1902 (1931), 41-42.

†† E. T. Vaughan: *Some Account of the Rev. Thomas Robinson* (1816), 238.

and this foundation was supplemented by an endowment for putting out poor boys as apprentices.* But the most munificent foundation of this type in the town has a much closer connection with Samuel Carte and the battle with the Arians.

One of the churchwardens of St. Martin's in 1731 at the time of the petition to the Duchy of Lancaster was Gabriel Newton, a wealthy Alderman, once Mayor, the general nature of whose outlook may be easily gathered from his observation that to abrogate the Athanasian Creed from the rubrics of the Church of England would be as great a disaster as the cutting off the head of the royal martyr Charles I.† Gabriel Newton first founded a school during his lifetime, about 1737, three years before Carte's death,‡ but owing to opposition in the town, no doubt not unprovoked, to some of his projects, he refused to continue his school and threatened to transfer his benefactions elsewhere. However, in 1760, before his death two years later, he conveyed large estates in Leicestershire, and afterwards bequeathed by his will personal estate of great value to the Corporation of Leicester as trustees, to endow schools for the education of poor boys in Leicester, and in several other towns, the boys all to be sons of Anglican parents. There was nothing unusual in this, but the conditions of the endowment are very characteristic. No place could receive the benefit of the legacy unless the Athanasian Creed were publicly recited in the church on the days specified by the rubrics of the Prayer Book, and unless the boys of his school were allowed to sing the psalms and tone the responses. For Newton regarded the Athanasian Creed as "the completest body of divinity composed since the time of the Apostles," in this concurring, he said, with the opinion of Dr. Waterland, and set high value on the regular attendance of the boys of his school, the Greencoat boys, at the liturgical worship of the Church, as a powerful aid to the formation of Christian character. As a real conservative he also left an endowment for putting out poor boys as apprentices.§

The history of Newton's foundation is intricate and interesting: and the Corporation, as a keenly Anglican and Tory body, took great care to carry out the provisions of the foundation, particularly to safeguard the religious character of the

* P.R.O., C. 93/53/18. Nichols: *History*, i., 63.

† Charity Commissioners' Report (1838), 32, part v., p. 7. Gabriel Newton was an interesting character, and of sufficient importance that it is a pity there is no article on him in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

‡ *Gentleman's Magazine*, lix. (1789), part i., 203-204; C. J. Billson, *Leicester Memoirs* (1924), 135; Nichols, *op. cit.*, i., 514, note.

§ The principal sources of this very summary account are MS. Minutes of the Leicester Corporation; Nichols: *History*, i., part ii., 611; Charity Commissioners' Report, *loc. cit.*

schools.* What is important for our present purpose to note is that this munificent foundation is plainly the outcome of the High Church piety that Newton had joined with Carte to defend against the latitudinarianism of John Jackson, both in its doctrinal integrity and in the high value set on regularity and seemliness in liturgical worship. The insistence of Newton on the recitation of the Athanasian Creed undoubtedly associates his benefaction with the quarrel with Jackson.

V

Samuel Carte represents in several ways the typical problems of a parish priest of the first half of the century. His learning and numerous academical acquaintances, and his lively interest in what happened in the metropolis, suggest that we should soften down the contrast drawn by Macaulay between the clergy of the metropolis and Universities and those of the country.† Further, he indicates the directions in which we may look if we are to understand the contribution of the eighteenth century to the life of the Church. High Churchmen of his calibre, by their studies in antiquity, helped to maintain the tradition of a learned clergy. By their resistance to the minimizing doctrines of the Arianizing School they preserved whole the Trinitarian doctrine which was an indispensable foundation for the reviving work of the Oxford Movement; by their early attempts at popular education—it may be admitted even by the severest critics of the undoubted shortcomings of their philosophy of education—they made a first attempt at anything like a national system of schools;‡ and by their philanthropy, with the support of generous laity, they preserved the tradition of a Church whose pastoral office extended to all and sundry. With all this they were at their best a lovable and modest race of men. They could not be better described than in the words of Dean Church as

"kindly, helpful, respectable, sociable persons of good sense and character, workers in a routine which no one thought of breaking, sometimes keeping up their University learning, and apt to employ it in odd and not very profitable enquiries; apt too to value themselves on their cheerfulness and quick wit; but often dull and dogmatic and quarrelsome, often insufferably pompous."§

R. W. GREAVES.

* The endowments of these schools have had different histories in different places. The direct descendant of the Leicester foundation, Alderman Newton's School, provides a much more liberal and advanced education than anything contemplated by the Alderman. I hope to deal more fully with this subject in a future publication.

† Macaulay, ed. Firth, i., 319-320.

‡ Worked out more fully by Sarah Trimmer and the other supporters of the National Society. See J. W. Adamson, *Short History of Education* (1930), 197-199, for a critical estimate of these schools.

§ R. W. Church: *The Oxford Movement* (ed. 1922), 10-11.

THE EPICLESIS: SOME CONSIDERATIONS

My own generation of students lies under such obligations to Mr. Atchley that the honour of a "Criticism" from him can be received only with docility and the most careful reconsideration of positions. I should be much vexed if anything I am to write should even suggest a disregard for the opinions of a distinguished specialist. But I must confess at the outset that I find some of his methods of argument a little unnerving.

This had better be illustrated. I had written, quite rightly, that "Syrian liturgical traditions are abnormal, *e.g.* in administering Confirmation *before* Baptism *without* imposition of hands." The facts are notorious and universally admitted (*e.g. Liturgy and Worship*, p. 449). In the extant Syriac literature prior to *c.* 650 A.D. there is mention only of an unction before immersion with *no* post-baptismal unction or imposition of hands. (The evidence is conveniently summarized *ap.* Connolly, *Homilies of Narsai*, p. xlii. *sq.*) Mr. Atchley roundly styles such an order "impossible" (p. 34). As it actually existed I prefer the word "abnormal." It may be that Mr. Atchley did not quite understand my allusion, but he does both himself and me less than justice when he goes on to "imagine" (his word) that I was involved in some complicated perversity with a modern Syrian rite on which, to say truth, I have never set eyes. The same paragraph of Mr. Atchley's deplores my omission to note what he reckons another Syrian "abnormality"—"viz., the direction of the anamnesis . . . to the Son instead of the Father." I could not do so—if only because so incomplete a repertory of texts as Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl* contains (p. 61 *sq.*) more than a dozen such anamneses addressed to the Son, framed on a non-Syrian model, from Italy, Spain and Gaul.

Or again (I am taking points at random), Mr. Atchley asserts flatly (p. 30) that no Monophysite "at any time" followed Severus in taking the Words of Institution as consecratory. I am sorry to contradict him, but several of them do so, *e.g.* the ninth-century Bishop John of Dara, *Comment. ad. c.* ii. *Eccl. Hierarch. S. Dionys.* There are others also. Yet upon this quite erroneous assertion Mr. Atchley bases an insinuation that the inconvenient evidence of Severus has been tampered with or fabricated.

Or again (p. 28), Mr. Atchley is clear that the liturgy St. Frumentius took to Abyssinia "must have been" that of

schools.* What is important for our present purpose to note is that this munificent foundation is plainly the outcome of the High Church piety that Newton had joined with Carte to defend against the latitudinarianism of John Jackson, both in its doctrinal integrity and in the high value set on regularity and seemliness in liturgical worship. The insistence of Newton on the recitation of the Athanasian Creed undoubtedly associates his benefaction with the quarrel with Jackson.

V

Samuel Carte represents in several ways the typical problems of a parish priest of the first half of the century. His learning and numerous academical acquaintances, and his lively interest in what happened in the metropolis, suggest that we should soften down the contrast drawn by Macaulay between the clergy of the metropolis and Universities and those of the country.† Further, he indicates the directions in which we may look if we are to understand the contribution of the eighteenth century to the life of the Church. High Churchmen of his calibre, by their studies in antiquity, helped to maintain the tradition of a learned clergy. By their resistance to the minimizing doctrines of the Arianizing School they preserved whole the Trinitarian doctrine which was an indispensable foundation for the reviving work of the Oxford Movement; by their early attempts at popular education—it may be admitted even by the severest critics of the undoubted shortcomings of their philosophy of education—they made a first attempt at anything like a national system of schools;‡ and by their philanthropy, with the support of generous laity, they preserved the tradition of a Church whose pastoral office extended to all and sundry. With all this they were at their best a lovable and modest race of men. They could not be better described than in the words of Dean Church as

"kindly, helpful, respectable, sociable persons of good sense and character, workers in a routine which no one thought of breaking, sometimes keeping up their University learning, and apt to employ it in odd and not very profitable enquiries; apt too to value themselves on their cheerfulness and quick wit; but often dull and dogmatic and quarrelsome, often insufferably pompous."§

R. W. GREAVES.

* The endowments of these schools have had different histories in different places. The direct descendant of the Leicester foundation, Alderman Newton's School, provides a much more liberal and advanced education than anything contemplated by the Alderman. I hope to deal more fully with this subject in a future publication.

† Macaulay, ed. Firth, i., 319-320.

‡ Worked out more fully by Sarah Trimmer and the other supporters of the National Society. See J. W. Adamson, *Short History of Education* (1930), 197-199, for a critical estimate of these schools.

§ R. W. Church: *The Oxford Movement* (ed. 1922), 10-11.

THE EPICLESIS: SOME CONSIDERATIONS

My own generation of students lies under such obligations to Mr. Atchley that the honour of a "Criticism" from him can be received only with docility and the most careful reconsideration of positions. I should be much vexed if anything I am to write should even suggest a disregard for the opinions of a distinguished specialist. But I must confess at the outset that I find some of his methods of argument a little unnerving.

This had better be illustrated. I had written, quite rightly, that "Syrian liturgical traditions are abnormal, *e.g.* in administering Confirmation *before* Baptism *without* imposition of hands." The facts are notorious and universally admitted (*e.g. Liturgy and Worship*, p. 449). In the extant Syriac literature prior to *c.* 650 A.D. there is mention only of an unction before immersion with *no* post-baptismal unction or imposition of hands. (The evidence is conveniently summarized *ap.* Connolly, *Homilies of Narsai*, p. xlii. *sq.*) Mr. Atchley roundly styles such an order "impossible" (p. 34). As it actually existed I prefer the word "abnormal." It may be that Mr. Atchley did not quite understand my allusion, but he does both himself and me less than justice when he goes on to "imagine" (his word) that I was involved in some complicated perversity with a modern Syrian rite on which, to say truth, I have never set eyes. The same paragraph of Mr. Atchley's deplores my omission to note what he reckons another Syrian "abnormality"—"viz., the direction of the anamnesis . . . to the Son instead of the Father." I could not do so—if only because so incomplete a repertory of texts as Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl* contains (p. 61 *sq.*) more than a dozen such anamneses addressed to the Son, framed on a non-Syrian model, from Italy, Spain and Gaul.

Or again (I am taking points at random), Mr. Atchley asserts flatly (p. 30) that no Monophysite "at any time" followed Severus in taking the Words of Institution as consecratory. I am sorry to contradict him, but several of them do so, *e.g.* the ninth-century Bishop John of Dara, *Comment. ad. c.* ii. *Eccl. Hierarch. S. Dionys.* There are others also. Yet upon this quite erroneous assertion Mr. Atchley bases an insinuation that the inconvenient evidence of Severus has been tampered with or fabricated.

Or again (p. 28), Mr. Atchley is clear that the liturgy St. Frumentius took to Abyssinia "must have been" that of

Hippolytus or an early form of the Ethiopic *Lit. of the Apostles* which is partly based on Hippolytus. I am not myself competent to make precise statements as to the hypothetical rite used by a half-legendary mission, but certain facts can, I think, be established by evidence. (1) The *Lit. of the Apostles* is (from its textual variants) based on that Ethiopic version of Hippolytus' *Ap. Trad.* which is found in the Ethiopic Canon Law, the *Sinodos*. (2) This version contains textual corruptions only explicable as mistranslations from an Arabic version. (I am in a position to supplement even the conclusive observations of Horner on this point.) (3) Arabic was not spoken in Egypt (the original home of the *Sinodos*) before the seventh-century Arab conquest. (4) St. Frumentius is said to have been consecrated by St. Athanasius and certainly lived in the fourth or fifth century. Some may think it likely that a purely Egyptian mission used an Egyptian rite of the type of Serapion, and an Abyssinian priest in the *Rev. de l'Orient Chrétien* (xxix., 1934, p. 187 *sq.*) has shewn reason to think that both the Ethiopic *Sinodos* and the *Lit. of the Apostles* date from the fourteenth century, and that the *Lit. of St. Mark* had previously been in use. The earliest certain reference to the former with which I am acquainted is in the "Church Law" of King Zar'a Jacob (A.D. 1434-68) translated by Dillmann. Before this date we *know* nothing certainly of the history of the Ethiopic Liturgy.

I have noted the consecrated total of thirty-nine such points on which Mr. Atchley seems either excessively positive or even not to accord with the evidence. Some of them (*e.g.* those above) scarcely affect the main argument, but their total effect is disturbing. I have no intention of signalizing them all, but it seems only due to Mr. Atchley's standing as a liturgiologist and to the weight of received opinion which he undoubtedly represents to examine the essential points of the evidence in the light of his discussion.

First, what are we talking about? Mr. Atchley's last paragraph reproaches me for broaching the question at all, since to seek a "moment of consecration" is to foster division. The blame for division must lie with the innovators, and I was defending the English tradition of more than thirteen centuries. Nor did I use the phrase he thrusts upon me; I spoke of "the essential form of the Eucharist." And I put the matter thus for a particular reason. The West finds this in the Institution only, but modern Eastern pronouncements and theologians make a consecratory epiclesis* an essential of the rite, and

* *I.e.* a prayer that the Holy Ghost will (in some phrase) identify the Bread and Wine with the Body and Blood of Christ. The *Lit. of Addai and Mari* to which Mr. Atchley appeals (p. 30) is technically invalid on both E. and W. requirements, but in its earliest known form (*ap.* Narsai, *c.* A.D. 500) both defects seem to have

some Eastern writers tend to make it the only essential. Even among ourselves peculiar language has been used. To name no lesser men, Bishop Seabury at the first General Convention of the American Church twice refused to celebrate because the rite to be used was that of 1662, saying, "I hardly consider the form to be used as strictly amounting to a consecration"; and Dr. White was eventually obliged to celebrate in his place. It is pathetic that a commission of Russian theologians should since have pronounced that Dr. Seabury's own epiclesis will not "satisfy" Orthodox requirements (*Alcuin Club Tracts*, xii., p. 2). In the circumstances, the rite of 1662 being what it is, and "the Children of the East" among us being still "as the grasshoppers for multitude," historical enquiry as to the antiquity and universality of the epiclesis is certainly not barred to Anglicans.

What, then, is the early evidence? That of the only known ante-Nicene rite, of Hippolytus, is clearly central.

This is found in two forms: (1) A version in Latin (L) and Ethiopic (E) which *has* an epiclesis, but which will not as it stands make Greek or even good sense or grammar. (2) A Syriac text (T) which has *no* epiclesis, but which does make Greek and sense and grammar. This is found in a document, the *Test. of our Lord*, which elsewhere preserves one or two readings of Hippolytus which LE adapt to later usage. (I am prepared to illustrate this.) It seems clear that we cannot assess Hippolytus' quite crucial evidence until we decide what he actually wrote, and that this must be settled by the principles of purely textual criticism and not on liturgiological grounds. And it is quite certain that no one can or does accept the LE text just as it stands, without some emendation. It is not only the omission of the epiclesis by T (which restores the grammatical soundness of the sentence) but the inherent weakness of the LE text itself which raises difficulties.

Mr. Atchley champions the textually inferior LE reading (he does not say on what grounds) though this raises the "admittedly difficult problem" of why T "omitted" an epiclesis standing in a text which T clearly respected. Mr. Atchley's solution of this problem does, I am sure, some injustice to his own knowledge of T's contents. It is that T "could not tolerate a sentence which asked the Father *to send* the Holy Spirit" and took it upon himself to suppress the epiclesis altogether, lest by this intolerable phrase he seem to consent with the prevailing subordination of the Holy Ghost by the Macedonians.

---

been supplied, as also, apparently, in the time of Ebed-Jesus of Soba (thirteenth century). But it certainly looks as though it properly should contain neither Institution nor prayer for the changing of the elements into the Body and Blood.

T's intolerance was at all events not continuous. In his prayer for the consecration of a Bishop (i. 21) this writer quite happily retains the clause "Send to thy holy and pure Church . . . Him who was given to thy Holy One," which seems more open to misconstruction than the harmless epiclesis in LE, or indeed than any epiclesis I remember. T has its vagaries, but it is a little difficult to contend that a writer to whom this sort of thing came naturally was really very fiercely on his guard against Macedonianism. Nor do such mutilations of a text usually result in a more coherent sentence than the original. Mr. Atchley styles his suppression-theory "the probable explanation." I fear that to me it seems a pure hypothesis, devoid of evidence and counter to observable facts, which does not even attempt to meet one half of the problem, the incoherence of LE at this point. I am not unbiased, but I still venture to think the suggestion of interpolation in LE meets *all* the facts better than any other.

In default of further ante-Nicene liturgical evidence my paper gave attention to early eucharistic theology. Father Hebert, S.S.M., had suggested (THEOLOGY, October 1933) that the E. rites with their climax in the epiclesis and the W. with its emphasis on the Dominical Words do in effect (with whatever inward reconciliation) reflect two separate theological ideas, eucharistic consecration by the Spirit and by the Son respectively. I was at pains to point out (p. 126) that both E. and W. do in theory acknowledge both attributions, but I accepted and accept Father Hebert's distinction as roughly true both as regards the general theological emphasis of each Church and the ethos of the two types of rite. What I endeavoured to do was to trace back the two theological ideas, consecration by the Spirit and by the Son, as far as possible.

So far as my knowledge carries me, and Mr. Atchley has not supplemented it, the ante-Nicene evidence for consecration by the Spirit is confined to certain Gnostic formulæ and two passing references in Catholic documents, all of Syrian origin. After *c.* A.D. 330 both the doctrine and its liturgical expression in the epiclesis of the Spirit can be traced with certainty *in Syria*. Outside Syria no trace of either is to be found in the extant evidence before *c.* A.D. 375.

I am uncertain whether Mr. Atchley seriously intended to dispute this account of the matter, but he has produced (p. 34) four passages apparentlywith some suggestion that they ought to have been included in my survey of the evidence. The most important from its origin and date—Rome *c.* A.D. 240—is Novatian —(*De Trin.* 29), which he cites in the following form: "The Holy Ghost 'marks out (*or* divides, *distinxit* . . .) the Gospel sacra-

ments, Who was in them the enlightener of Divine things." It will save space if instead of discussing this I give the passage in the excellent translation of H. Moore (S.P.C.K., 1919, p. 126) with which those who consult the original will not quarrel. "And as the Lord was presently to go away into heaven, He could not but give the Paraclete to His disciples. . . . For it is He who strengthened their souls and minds, who clearly brought out for them the mysteries of the Gospel [*evangelica sacramenta distinxit*], who threw light within them [*sc.* the Apostles] upon Divine things, by whom they were made strong to fear neither bonds nor imprisonment," etc. Mr. Atchley will, I am sure, recognize that by mistranslating *distinxit* into the present tense he has misled himself as to the relevance of this account of the Apostles' inspiration.

Mr. Atchley also cites as teaching consecration by the Spirit St. Basil (*De Sp. S.*, 49): "The coming of Christ and the Spirit goes before; *in the flesh in His coming, but the Spirit inseparable;* works of power, gifts of healing, but by the Holy Spirit; *the devils were cast out in the Spirit of God.*" By some misfortune Mr. Atchley omitted the clauses italicized, though they make the application of the whole passage to the incarnate ministry of our Lord rather more clear.

On his other two passages Mr. Atchley states as a fact that I "did not notice that Didymus of Alexandria (*De Trin.*, i. 34) states that 'all things subsist through the Son while they are hallowed by the Holy Spirit,' and again (ii. 5): 'as by the Son all things came into being, so by the Spirit all things are (*sic*) hallowed.'" I assure Mr. Atchley that I had observed this and also that the first passage begins, "Though each Person could *create and make* all things, it pleased God the Father that all things should subsist through God the Son," etc., and that the second runs in the original ". . . so by the Spirit all things *were* (*i.e.* at the Creation) hallowed" (ἡγιάσθη). Both passages are concerned solely with the creation of the world, with which my paper had nothing to do.

I hope it is not cavalier to enquire exactly what light any or all of these passages may be supposed to cast on the use of the liturgical epiclesis. If this is all which can be produced after, presumably, exhaustive search, it goes some way towards demonstrating my contention that neither the epiclesis of the Spirit nor the doctrine of consecration it embodies can be traced *at all* outside Syria before *c.* A.D. 375.

Mr. Atchley has, however, his own explanation of this silence—the epiclesis was being kept dark for controversial reasons. "Where," he asks (p. 34) "was the sense of appealing to a prayer asking for the Holy Spirit *to be sent*" when the world

was full of Macedonians claiming that the Scriptural "sending" of the Spirit was the very hall-mark of inferiority to the Godhead? One might answer that St. Ambrose, quite a sensible person, did cite the epiclesis in proof of the Spirit's Deity at the very climax of the controversy (*De Sp. S.*. iii. 16, A.D. 381). But it really cannot be allowed that the doctrine of the Spirit's "mission" presented any particular difficulty to the Doctors of that age. They face and discuss every text raised by the Subordinationists on that head. It is true they are careful to guard this doctrine from misunderstanding and depravation, but so guarded they teach it quite boldly as an integral part of Trinitarian faith. Had the epiclesis been in general use, and had it smacked quite as strongly of Macedonius to the fourth century as it does to Mr. Atchley, it is long odds that it would have been dragged into the controversy when men were quarrelling over doxologies and hymns, and Catholics been forced to explain or defend its use. Coming as the climax of vernacular liturgies recited aloud, the scandal could scarcely be hushed up, even by a conspiracy of silence among *all* the theologians outside Syria. Does Mr. Atchley really contend that that word "send" (which is not in all epicleses) constituted so disastrous a point in favour of heresy that no Catholic writer outside Syria ever dared mention the epiclesis *or even the theology it embodied*? Writers like Basil and Didymus in works written expressly to enumerate the Divine operations of the Spirit devote chapter after chapter to His operations in Baptism. Yet they never once so much as suggest that the Spirit has any relation whatsoever to the eucharist. For men who heard or used a consecratory epiclesis of the Spirit at every liturgy that is a strange omission. Again it seems to me that Mr. Atchley does not face more than half his difficulty.

Where we can trace the liturgical use of the epiclesis of the Spirit—in fourth-century Syria—the doctrine it embodies simultaneously finds explicit recognition, though Macedonianism was at least as prevalent there as elsewhere. In the non-Syrian evidence the position is reversed. Whereas the non-Syrian theologians when they speak of the Spirit do *not* mention the eucharist, when they speak of the eucharist they *do* mention the Logos. And the only extant non-Syrian rite of the period, Serapion's, clearly ascribes consecration to the Logos. Without exception the ante-Nicene evidence outside Syria associates consecration with the second, not the third, Person. The earliest known anaphora, of Hippolytus, in what is on purely textual grounds its more probable form, has no epiclesis but only the Words of Institution, and is entirely concerned with the Logos. The first patristic account of Catholic worship, in St. Justin's

Apology, cites the Words of Institution as "a form of prayer which comes from" Jesus Himself "by which food is made eucharist," and St. Justin associates consecration with the Logos. (This Mr. Atchley admits, but contents himself with dismissing St. Justin as "not an authorized exponent of Christian dogma"—a difficult thing to be *c.* A.D. 150.) Nothing Mr. Atchley has written removes any one of these facts.

In some later evidence I adduced Mr. Atchley finds matter for bleak disagreement, and I might find a little to say in reply. But the main course of events after the fourth century is not in dispute, and I will confine myself to the one point on which I have a correction to acknowledge. I had pointed out a curious hesitation between Eastern and Western views in SS. Chrysostom and Ambrose, who both ascribe consecration now to the Son and the Dominical Words and now to the epiclesis of the Spirit. If by citing St. Chrysostom (*De Prod. Judæ*, i. 6) as "Christ by the Priest recites . . ." (as on p. 137) instead of (as, rightly, on p. 193) "The Priest in the person of Christ recites 'This is My Body.' These words transform the elements"—I should have misled anyone as to the force of the passage, I must express my regret. It was stupid, and I stand rebuked. But Mr. Atchley (p. 30) insists that there is in these Fathers "one clear and consistent idea" and not, as I suggested, two unrelated ones. I have examined afresh all the eucharistic passages known to me in these writers, and I can find none ascribing consecration to the Son or the Dominical Words which also mentions the epiclesis of the Spirit, or *vice versa*. The point is not whether Mr. Atchley can conciliate the varying utterances of these Fathers, but whether they themselves ever tried to do so.

In the course of ages many admirable additions have been made to the original simple essentials of the Church's sacramental rites, whose sole purpose is only to explain, to enforce or to adorn the vital sacramental action and form. But of some of these adjuncts, most edifying and beautiful in themselves, the principal result has been a distortion of theology and the obscuring, even the ousting of the scriptural essentials themselves. Such cases as the Tradition of the Instruments in Holy Order and the Eastern practice in Confirmation will recur of themselves to all. When one considers the development of Eastern eucharistic theology it becomes a matter for concern whether the eucharistic epiclesis of the Spirit be not of this class. A full investigation will raise questions which I have felt it expedient to skirt, and in particular will require to pursue "the Origins of the Epiclesis" further than the statements that πνεῦμα ἅγιον can in early writers mean the

Logos, and that the epiclesis of the Spirit proper first appears in fourth-century Syria. There are alliances and affinities between such documents as the *Liturgy of Addai and Mari* and the newly published *Liturgical Catecheses* of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the one hand, and such things as the eucharistic formulæ of the Gnostic *Acts of Thomas* or the Samaritan epiclesis of "the Spirit of God" over sacrificed sheep on the other, which can scarcely be excluded from the discussion.

But there are bigger problems to which it may be that the available evidence scarcely affords a conclusive solution. As Constant says somewhere: "There is always one more fact which upsets everything." I am content for the moment with the submission that so far as the extant evidence carries us the epiclesis of the Spirit and the doctrine it embodies is of purely Syrian origin and remained unknown outside Syria until late in the fourth century. The one primitive catholic essential form of the eucharist is, as Justin and Hippolytus witness, the narrative of the Institution alone. Not only the *Book of Common Prayer* but such documents as the "Lambeth Quadrilateral" and the "South Indian Church Scheme" are in this in line with the "Apostolic Tradition" of the rite as the second century knew it. Surely, upon reflection this must prove as gratifying to orientalizing Anglicans like Mr. Atchley as it is to those other Anglicans who, on this point, "need no repentance."

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

DR. RASHDALL'S THEOLOGY

DEAR SIR,

In the October number of THEOLOGY one of the writers in the Little Symposium states that the late Dean Rashdall had once said that at his ordination he had told Bishop Lightfoot that he definitely did not believe in the Virgin Birth. I was acquainted with Dr. Rashdall's views for over eighteen years, and it was his custom to discuss his views freely. He told me that he had never denied it. Nowhere in his writings does he state disbelief in this part of the creed and it was his wish not to do so. It is a pity that others should not respect such a wish. His position was, I understand, as follows. He thought that all who believed in the Virgin Birth did so because they already believed in the Incarnation and the Divinity of Christ, and that those who did not accept these truths would not be led to do so by this miracle; perhaps they would, on the contrary, be hindered. He preferred to offer, for these beliefs, grounds more acceptable to modern but unconvinced minds. Also he did not think it safe to base the whole fabric of Christianity upon a fact that he feared might prove historically insecure, and also again that this miracle was not bound up with and essential to belief in the Incarnation. Feeling this, though he would never deny it, yet he would never preach it formally in the pulpit, where he felt the preacher could only teach those truths which he could personally, and with full conviction, defend. He was so particular on this point that he avoided the use of rhetoric in his sermons lest he should be led to add a word to what he entirely believed to be the absolute truth. But his aim was always to make the great Christian beliefs available to modern men, not to deny those which others reverence. And this he never did. Anyone who will take the trouble to search his writings will find that what I say is true. If your correspondent had said that Dr. Rashdall told Bishop Lightfoot that, feeling uncertainty about the historical evidence for the Virgin Birth, and for the reasons I have mentioned, he did not wish definitely to teach it but rather simply to leave it on one side, he, I think, would have been nearer the truth.

With apologies for troubling you,

Yours truly,

CONSTANCE RASHDALL.

105, BANBURY ROAD,
OXFORD.
October 17, 1934.

NOTES

THE PROBLEM OF CHURCH AND STATE.

An Anglican Contribution to the Œcumenical Study Conference, Paris, April 8-14, 1934, arranged by the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work.

I

THE relation of Church and State has never in the Anglican Church been formulated on theological grounds. The question has received theoretical attention from time to time since the Reformation compromise, but only in consequence of historical events which practically affected the relation between the Church and the State. The question throughout has been coloured and restricted in discussion, both within the Anglican Church and in the thought of the Free Churches, by the fact of the "Establishment" of the Church of England. The "Establishment" of the Church of England took a decisive turn with the assertion of the Royal Supremacy over the Church by Henry VIII., and is still a fact. This fact has had a curious history which has raised several times important questions which could have been treated theologically, but which the Anglican Church has never systematically attempted so to treat.

In this paper I can give only a few of the important turning-points of history and a few of the main theoretical conceptions in the relation of Church and State so far as it concerns the Anglican Church, and follow them with some considerations which seem to me to require a fundamental reconsideration of the whole question in all the post-Reformation Christian Churches: *Roman, Anglican and Protestant.*

The English Reformation was largely Lutheran in principle and governmental in origin, and this tended to a distinctly Erastian conception of the Church. The King is head of the Church and the Royal Supremacy operates in spiritual matters through Parliament. In Scotland, by contrast, the Reformation was Calvinist in principle and popular in origin; there the King rules over the Church through the Assembly, a Church body. In England the Church Assembly known as Convocation was assembled at the King's direction, but was not permitted to confer or deliberate on any of the affairs of the Church. This interpretation of Henry VIII.'s act of submission was later denied. Under the Stuart Kings the doctrine of Divine Right of the Monarch seems to have been used not in intention to restrict the English Church, but to resist the Calvinist Church State in Scotland. It worked out in practice in the secular interest, and was directed, not against the Pope, but against Calvin. Here curiously the Scottish and Jesuit attempts to limit the authority of the King met, and gave rise to the seventeenth-century epigram:

> "A Scot and Jesuit hand in hand
> First taught the world to say
> That subjects ought to have command
> And monarchs to obey."

The High Church party supported the King's claims, because of their resistance to Calvinism, and tended to clothe his office with mystical

significance. As the doctrine of Divine Right became weakened theologically it tended to be regarded as based on nature, and this led in Filmer and Bodin to a conception of sovereignty even more difficult to qualify.

In general there were two main conceptions. The first, taught by Hooker, regarded Church and State as the same persons in different capacities, *the Church as the Englishman at prayer* (Elizabethan Settlement, Laud, Hobbes, first Parliament of Charles II.). It gradually became weakened into a conception of an *alliance*. A later theory held with Warburton (1736) that the Church with its moral sanctions existed to help the State to enforce law and order. Both views were concerned with the welfare, not of the Church, but of the State. A protest against a latitudinarian revision of the Prayer Book in 1689 had already led to the suppression of the Church's own Assembly, Convocation.

The next important moment was the protest against this whole conception which flared out as the Oxford Movement early in the nineteenth century. The question was raised as to the Church's right to determine its own life, and it was asserted that though the Church of England was the Church of the nation, the foundation of its authority lay in a source outside the political authority of the State. Tract 49 enlarged on the Church as the inheritor of the Ancient Covenant; Tract 86 described the servitude of the Church to the political power as a *visitation of Divine judgment for the Church's shortcomings*. The Church derived not from the State but from that visible supernational and supernatural body which came into the world as the effect of the Incarnation. Pusey and Keble held that the spiritual sovereignty of the Church was implicit in the English Reformation settlement and had been forfeited. Bishop Hamilton, a generation later, writes: "When I speak of the Church, I am speaking of the visible Kingdom of the Mediator; and when I speak of its authority, I mean that it has the power and responsibility of defending the truth of God, and that this real since delegated and inalienable power is wholly spiritual, and owes nothing to any temporal source. But this kingdom which is not of this world was to find its place in the midst of the kingdoms of this world, and when placed in them, had to exercise its independent authority in juxtaposition to the august and equally independent authority of the State." It is important to notice that the Tractarians' fight for the independent sovereignty of the Church was not merely in the interests of ecclesiastical liberty for its own sake, but was prompted by the conditions of the national life for which the Tractarians thought the Church had serious responsibility. The secularization of the life of the people largely due to the rapacity of commercialism and the spread of scientific specialist knowledge, untempered by any but utilitarian philosophy, was the real *National Apostacy* against which Keble preached in the sermon that started the Movement.

In speaking out about the spiritual condition of the people and the failure of the Church to express its divine power in the world, the Movement was compelled to say something about Religion and Civilization. It had to resist both the secularist liberalism which supported the materialist, callous, optimism of industrialism and also the humanist secularism of protests against it. Two months before Keble's Assize Sermon, Robert Owen had proclaimed "the commencement on this day of the promised millennium, founded on natural principles and consistent practice."

The Tractarians having been drawn into the question of the relation of religion and civilization, one group of their successors, the authors of *Lux Mundi*, in the person of Dr. Illingworth, went right over to the view that "secular civilization is nothing but the providential correlation and counterpart of the Incarnation. For the Word did not desert the rest of His creation to become incarnate." It is instructive to notice that this exalted view of secular life appears under the editorship of Bishop Gore, who as much as anyone was prepared for the Church to make severe judgments upon the secular order. I find this interesting fact running through the whole English Church history on the question: the more the State is regarded as in the order of creation, the more severe become criticisms by Churchmen upon its particular faults.

Before pursuing this point, the influence of Dr. John Neville Figgis must be recorded. In his works *The Divine Right of Kings*, *The Churches in the Modern State*, and *From Gerson to Grotius*, he pressed a large number of Churchmen to review the position of the Church in the State by following Otto von Gierke in emphasizing the independent life of associations within the State, of which the Church was one. But the other question of the legitimacy of the Church using her spiritual authority to make judgments upon the secular order was raised by the Archbishops' Commission on Industrial Problems in 1918, and by the intervention of leaders of the Churches with the Government during the General Strike of 1926. These were told by the Prime Minister "to keep off the grass" because politics were not the Church's pasture, and because what was economically unsound could not be ethically considered, the State reserving the right to decide the meaning of "economically unsound." Unconsciously the Church was appealing to something corresponding to Natural Law, as to what was "fair" and "just," and assumed the right to raise questions about the State.

In 1928 the domestic problem of the Church was raised again by the rejection by Parliament of the Church's demand for the revision of its service books. Since then the Church of England has almost made up its mind to exercise its spiritual autonomy, but has not yet found how to give it political effect. In the meantime the larger problem of the Church's responsibility for the right conception of the State has received attention largely through the work of William Temple, the present Archbishop of York. In *Christianity and the State* and *Essays in Christian Politics* some of the theological issues which interest us are raised. But let us go back a moment. While on the patristic theory of the State expressed from time to time, it is a power ordained of God, instituted by Him in consequence of sin for which it is both a punishment and a remedy, there has been a steady tradition, which goes back through Aquinas to Aristotle, that the State is natural, and not artificial, that it is good *per natura*, not merely as a corrective of evil. This on the whole is the view of the Archbishop of York, and, as I have pointed out, it implies that an actual State may be wrong in its judgments and may be rebuked by the Church if the Church has the conscience and mind to do so. This conception rejects the view set forward in some of the papers representing the Lutheran and Calvinist attitude, that the State, being merely a corrective and preservative construction, finds its characteristic quality in the use of compulsion. While delimiting the State to a functional position in the larger life of the Community, and distinguishing between society and its governmental organ the State, Temple asserts that the

State's right to employ force rests upon the fact that it acts for a community, members of which have certain purposes in common and membership of which cannot be repudiated. That is to say, it rests upon a conception of man as *per essentiam* a social being and as always a social being, the effect of sin being not to destroy this fact but to pervert it.

Another notable landmark in the controversy is Bishop Henson's reiterated plea for Disestablishment, for the sake, not of the Church's existence, but of her responsibility. "The State has become effectively secularized, and now, under the fiction of neutrality, undermines the indispensable postulates of the Christian religion. The morality of Christ is heavily challenged throughout Christendom, and in some important departments . . . has been openly repudiated. In these circumstances the ancient intimacy of Church and State has created a formidable danger by predisposing the unreflecting multitude to assume that what the State enacts must necessarily accord with what the Church teaches. . . . It follows that to assert the inherent *authority* of the Church is ultimately to affirm the principle of Christ's supremacy in human life, and to acquiesce in such a subordination of the Church to the State . . . is ultimately to allow the claim of Cæsar to override and wholly to submerge the claim of God."

There has during the last twelve years been growing in influence a group of thinkers and workers in the Anglo-Catholic movement which has addressed itself to the problem of Christian Sociology, and which makes an annual contribution of thought in the Anglo-Catholic School of Sociology and in its journal *Christendom*. Theologically it is the heir of the Tractarians and a reaction, based upon the affirmation of the supernatural character of the Church, to the identifying of the Church with any of the secular movements to redress social evils. As I have been closely in this group, I would offer a statement of the present problem from what I believe to be its point of view.

II

It is necessary to reconsider the whole question in the light of certain facts which have made a difference to the nature of Church and State since the theoretical and experimental statements in the post-Reformation tradition of their relations were made.

1. Those statements assume that the Church and the State are the same people in different capacities: a Christian State. This is no longer true; we have now three terms: Church, State and People. The people is not the State, as we have repeatedly been reminded; and the people is not the Church, but a secularized population, of which the significance is, not that it is sinful, which is always true, but that it acknowledges no Christian principle. This fact affects profoundly our problem, which is not a problem of Church and State *vis-à-vis* one another, but the responsibility for the soul of a people. Totalitarianism in the State is a rival claim upon the soul of a people to that of the Church. Therefore our present problem is a problem of the Church.

2. This fact of the secularization of human life does not arise mainly from the extension of the State's powers. This is rather the effort of the State to recover significance in the life of a people which has become disintegrated through the confusion of social means and ends as the

remedy of secularization. The secularization of life is largely due to the failure of the Church: so the Problem of the Church is not primarily its independence, which must be upheld, but freedom to exercise its responsibility for, not Christian man, but man. Totalitarianism is not a phenomenon to which the Church can pharisaically say "No"; it is a phenomenon which should turn the Church to a revolutionary penitence for its apostacy. The Church's distinctiveness must be upheld, not as independence, but so that the priority of the Spiritual can be proclaimed as giving an end to political, economic and cultural means. Secularization has elevated these means into ends, and resulted, not in social evils, for they are always with us, but in social disintegration. And totalitarianism is the self-corrective effort of the State, and of the community of men, to give a purpose to the functional orders of society—economics, culture, family, and so on. By asserting the sovereignty of the Spiritual *in vacuo*, and by ignoring that priority, distinctiveness, involve relationship, the Church has encouraged secularization and its first attitude towards State Absolutism must be: *mea culpa*.

3. We cannot any longer discuss the relation of Church and State as if they were two independent bodies confronting one another. The State may be supreme politically; but politics is not supreme in secular society. The fact which renders most of our theories of Church and State irrelevant is the domination of politics by economics and finance; and this is most true in democratic States. The subservience of politics to plutocracy is the main fact about the State confronting the Church today. The Church's problem is not primarily, Can I hold my independence of this other sovereign body? but, What have I to say about politics becoming an instrument of one of its functional elements: economic interests tending to absolute sway over human existence? In this light, State absolutism takes a different aspect; it appears as the self-preservative effort of the State to resist the destructive effects of a functional activity of society assuming practical sovereignty. One of the most significant and naïve things said recently were words of Dr. Schacht a few months ago: "If you restore a nation's moral and national self-respect, it will be easier to get the people to submit to a lower standard of living." A lower standard of living is dictated, not by nature in this age of abundance, but by the theories and interests concerned with the devices of economic life. We cannot discuss the State today and ignore entirely the question put to the modern world by Karl Marx, whether (stated in our way, not his) the political organ is not the administrator of economic forces which are false to the order of creation under which they exist.

4. We cannot divorce the present deification of the State from the feebleness of faith in anything at all, for which the Church's failure is largely responsible, a failure to affirm its distinctiveness from the State and Society by its universality, its claim to the whole of man. To recover that claim is the only condition of its saying anything about the State at all. If we accept the thesis that the *essentia* of the State is compulsion for the sake of peace and order in a fallen world, we have nothing to say to the State except that it is failing even to do that.

I would say that to make as severe judgments upon the State as are necessary we must with the Archbishop of York contend that force, though the instrument, is not the *raison d'être* of the State; that the common purposes of men in co-operation are its *raison d'être*. And that not the State, but State absolutism, is the result of sin. When the State

cannot keep order except through totalitarianism, that is a judgment upon sin which has its social effects in the reversal of means and ends (following Augustine's definition of sin). To me, if the State is fundamentally a remedy by force for sin, the fact that the effects of sin are infinite, as Christian dogmatics have asserted and Protestant dogmatics with peculiar emphasis, then the power of the State must be infinite.

The Church's concern is thus primarily not with the fact that the State uses force to preserve order, but what are the forces which disorder society. What is the precise effect of sin in social life? Sin does not set man against man directly, it perverts the right order of his interests and activities and purposes, and makes him anti-social when these are thwarted; and they are thwarted more by the logic of God's world, to which their disorder is opposed, than by the fact that men get in each other's way.

In brief, the group for which I speak would say that the problem of the State for the Church cannot be approached except as a problem of the relative spheres of Church and State in Society, and by a penitential recognition on the part of the Church that the State assumes absolute sovereignty because the Church has been concerned with its rights instead of its responsibility for the redemption of Society, by which I mean not producing a good society, but recalling the social life of man to its purpose of serving his spiritual destiny.

V. A. DEMANT.

THE KING AND HIS KINGDOM

THE Gospel *In Principio* may well be called the Church's favourite Gospel, for no other is read anything like so often in church. The critics, this many a day, have attributed to it a late date and denied it Apostolic authorship. But the critics do make mistakes, and ancient tradition has a way of coming to its own. The latest work on the Gospels, by Professor Torrey of Yale, maintains that the Gospel of St. John was originally written, with slight exceptions, in Aramaic, either before or about the same time as the Gospel of St. Luke, and certainly well before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The opening words of the Gospel, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," are, according to this writer, a summary of the preaching of John the Baptist, written in Judæa and at a time when the preaching of John and the impression made by him remained vivid.

St. John the Baptist, then, proclaimed Jesus not only as the Messiah, but as a Divine Person. The secret revealed to Mary at the Incarnation, "The holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," was revealed also to the last of the great prophets of Israel. Not that he was the first of the prophets to receive this revelation. Isaiah had taught that the Messiah to come should be a Divine-human being.

Through the ages of preparation God the Holy Ghost was speaking by the prophets and "at sundry times and in divers manners" preparing for the divulging of the fulness of the Gospel. But to the Baptist the prophetic heritage came with an increased clearness, as we might expect. He was able to point definitely to Jesus as the expected Messiah, the pre-existent Divine Person who had been made flesh and dwelt now among men. So Professor Torrey writes:

"The author of the Fourth Gospel consistently represents the Baptist as fully understanding the nature and mission of Jesus, and the utter failure of the people to comprehend and accept Him. He himself knew that this was the Son of God (i. 34), but was perfectly aware that *this was not believed by any other* in his day. Even the disciples of Jesus were still far from comprehending it; *no one* 'accepted his testimony.'"

It was not till later that St. Peter, speaking for the Apostles, made his confession of faith: "We believe and are sure that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The little band who were to be the nucleus and foundation of the Catholic Church had come thus to the acceptance, not by intellectual processes, but by faith in a divine revelation—"flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven"—of the central truth of the Christian system.

A whole theology of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation was to grow up in time. But already, in Galilee and Judæa, the central truth of that theology had been clearly proclaimed and gradually accepted. St. John's Gospel, written, according to Christian tradition, by the disciple whose relations with our Lord were most intimate, tells more clearly than any other the story of this proclamation and gradual acceptance. It reveals the Apostles as coming to recognize the omniscience of Jesus—"Now we know that thou knowest all things"—from their personal experience and from the light of revelation, from the presence among them of the true Light whose coming into the world illumined all who willed to receive Him.

It has been fashionable of late to assume that neither the Apostles nor even the Mother of Christ, proclaimed blessed for her belief, realized till after the Resurrection the Divinity of our Lord. Dr. Goudge has professed to discover the stages by which they came at long last to this belief. But behind this fashion in Anglican theology there lie fifty years of teaching which has minimized the predictive element in the Hebrew prophets, an element which all the exegesis of the past has insisted upon. Modern anthropology has prepared the way for a re-insistence on this predictive faculty by which the prophet foresaw the coming of a Messiah who should be a Divine Person, and modern study of the Old Testament is beginning to revert to Catholic tradition.

Those who have read such works as Eugene Osty's *Supra-normal Faculties in Man*, with its scientific examination of such faculties as the knowledge of events distant in time or space, will find no difficulty in believing that the prophets foreknew the coming of a Divine Messiah, and even detailed events of his life and passion, that in fact, with Abraham, they "rejoiced to see his day." What they saw, in distant and momentary vision, dawned in its splendour upon Mary, upon John the Baptist, the chosen herald, and finally upon Peter and the infant Church, to be passed on by them to future generations of believers. St. Peter's profession of faith, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living

God," was ready to be translated into the Church's hymns of praise, that Christians might sing:

"Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father,"
"O Lord, the only-begotten Son, Jesu Christ."

At the foundation of the credal system of the Church, the Kingdom of Christ, lies the fervent belief in her Divine King.

A. H. BAVERSTOCK.

A DUTCH VIEW OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.*

THIS is the first volume in a new "Outline of Theology" to be issued from Germany. Professor van der Leeuw's work is little known in England, but on the Continent he has gained a position of eminence among theological writers and students of religious origins. Making use of several languages, with a mind saturated in the consciousness of the primitive, the classical, and the modern worlds, with his eye trained by the arts of Ancient Egypt and Greece (without mentioning the great art of his own country), and with his ear tuned to the music of the great European Christian literatures, he has been publishing for nearly twenty years monographs and studies which are more than textbooks, and foreshadow the richness and intensity of the present work. *On the Idea of Deity in the Egyptian Pyramid Texts* (1916), *Introduction to Religious Phenomenology* (1925), *Gods and Men in Hellas* (1927), *Achnaton* (1928), *La Structure de la mentalité primitive* (1928), *There is a Dance in Heaven*† (1930), *Religion and Art:*‡ *A Study in their Relationship*—none of these, unfortunately, is as yet available in English, though most of them have appeared in German.

Looking at this list, incomplete as it is, being only a few of his major writings, it would seem that the author has all along been leading up to and preparing himself for a survey of the entire field of phenomenology revealed by recent scholarship, in the varied light thrown upon it by relevant sciences and contemporary schools of thought. It is this mastery of the material, the morass of facts surrounding the eager student of twenty years ago, this perfect assimilation and coherence, which distinguishes van der Leeuw's *Phänomenologie der Religion* from so many a worthy, painstakingly annotated textbook of the German professors. Here we have not detail upon detail, fact heaped upon fact, for the sake of proving the author's thoroughness and erudition; van der Leeuw writes with a nice precision, but never like a schoolmaster; without heat or thunder, without argumentation; his carefully documented facts strictly subordinated to the pattern and function of the whole. He is writing, he says himself, "not a compendium, but a vision" of phenomenology. In the procession and grouping of facts; the presentation of the long history of man in his attitude to the unseen; his approach to and reaction from the *mysterium tremendum* in any of its manifestations; and finally in his own attitude and "*Weltanschauung*"—we recognize the artist as well as the scholar or the philosopher. A mind that will not abstract life from, but add life to, the tradition, the symbol and the

* *The Phenomenology of Religion.* By Geraldus van der Leeuw (Professor of Theology at Groningen University).

† In dem Himmel ist ein Tanz. ‡ Wegen en Grenzen.

legend; which repudiates analysis as the key to truth and indicates the choreographic nature of religious history.

Professor Pettazoni indeed, in an otherwise highly appreciative review, questions his interpretation of the function of phenomenology as being too psychological and his assertion that it *must* ignore both the origin and the development of the phenomenon, a position which van der Leeuw maintains very strongly. To do so, Pettazoni holds, limits phenomenology unjustly, "for development of a given historical religion is a structure and as such is an object of comprehension, and this 'evolutionary' structure, or line of development, differing with each separate religion and comparable to each other, constitutes a phenomenon of historical religion which is essentially dynamic, as against the psychological, which is essentially static." It is not possible within the space of a short article to argue this point, but it seems doubtful whether the Italian professor has entirely grasped van der Leeuw's theory of "comprehension" and the discipline and limitation necessary for so complete an act.

Van der Leeuw follows after Dilthey and may be said to belong to a group which includes Söderblom, Wach and Otto, but his position is independent and his methodology not identical. He moves with freedom among the phenomena of opposing or related cultures, for, as he maintains, phenomenology is not theology (nor is it "comparative religion") but a sister science, and it is not static, it is not abstract, it is not colourless: it is living, many-hued, dynamic. He makes no claim to rigid impartiality or detachment; on the contrary, that the author is a Christian is fundamental, for as he says on p. 613: "(In historical research) there is always danger if the student is not the disciple of any particular religion, but an eclectic or an agnostic, or even if he is ignorant of the religion he *does* possess. His work will be imperilled . . . for no man can free himself from the manner of his being in this world: the sole result is an "unprejudiced" —*i.e.*, an uncomprehending experience whose norm is not scientifically defined and is therefore a wholly uncontrollable and unarguable representation." And again, on page 339: "The registration of the phenomena in one's own life. This registration is not of choice but of necessity. Reality is always *my* reality. . . . We must bear in mind that that which appears to us does not yield itself to us, but is only the sign to which we have to put the meaning. . . . And this meaning is impossible to know unless we experience it." "Only by yielding ourselves to be steeped in these spiritual traces of a vanished age . . ." "Certainly this experiencing is more of an art than a science. It is the original primitive art of the actor (whose art is indispensable to every other art and to religious science) which lives itself into the experience of others (even its own past experience, grown into that of someone else since yesterday !)."

It is characteristic of the author that statement of his own theory and method is not made until the end of the book is reached. "Phenomenology is neither metaphysics nor the comprehension of empirical reality. Phenomenology is only concerned with phenomena—*i.e.*, with what is apparent—it knows no 'background' of the phenomena, it is not a subtilized method but a genuine human activity, which consists not in losing oneself in the thing or in the ego, not in soaring god-like above or creeping like an animal below it, but in doing what neither God nor animal can do: standing on one side and observing that which appears. . . ." And again: "The whole, apparently complicated experience has ultimately no other end than pure realism. . . . It has nothing to

do with the modern theory that we must 'look on the world as unformed matter which we must first form; that we must play the rôle of lords of creation.' It desires but one thing: to testify to what has been shewn." Van der Leeuw's intentions may be shortly described as an effort to liberate so-called "comparative religion" from the bonds of positivistic and rationalistic theories as well as from the looser but not less embarrassing fetters of methodless empiricism—which is often only a mask of prejudice. To that end he tries to shew religion as a living power, having not only its own ways and reasons, but conscious of being ultimately a power from God. This holds good of the most primitive forms of religion as well as of those which are most closely related to our own religious notions.

The general scheme of the book is as follows: Part I. The Object of Religion. (This is Power, in its various forms, tabu, sacred thing, sacred animal, etc.) Part II. The Subject of Religion. (Man—as individual, human society, the soul.) Part III. Object and Subject in their effect upon each other. (Outwardly in sacrifice, divination, sacred temples, myth, formulæ, etc.; inwardly in the traffic of the soul with the Unseen.) Part IV. The World. Part V. Forms. Religions and Religious Founders and Teachers. And in conclusion, the Epilegomena.

There is a good and sufficient index; while the chief sources and references are indicated at the outset, copious notes and bibliographical references accompany the text. Although a great number of the latter are to Dutch works inaccessible to the general reader, this is a negligible matter, for the notes themselves witness to the amazing range of subjects and writings with which Professor van der Leeuw is familiarly acquainted and continually broaden the reader's comprehension and extend his horizon. Quotations from Goethe and Milton, Plato, Pascal, Persian mystics and the Vedantas, Dante, G. K. Chesterton, Julian of Norwich, Nietzsche, Maritain, to name a few at random, do but serve to illustrate the text, whereas the footnotes giving his authorities appear to include every possible relevant authority.

In addition to his larger writings van der Leeuw is a frequent contributor to reviews and periodicals; besides those of his native country, essays from his pen are to be found in the *International Review of Missions*, *Egyptian Religion*, the *Constructive Quarterly*, *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse*, *Studi e materiali della storia di religioni*.

It is to be hoped that an adequate English translation of some of van der Leeuw's most original work will soon appear; apart from questions of scholarship and research, on which, too, it will only then be possible to obtain a consensus of opinion, there is much to stimulate and assist the average lay mind. It is true that research into origins is no longer under the same suspicion of being an instrument of destruction, but we still need such a mind as thisto explore the remotest obscurities and the most imposing manifestations with the sole purpose of discovering their reality, and to return to us with a reasoned and serene conviction of the truth of the Christian Faith.

If overweighted tomes from German pens can be published in English editions, one expects to see work of this quality eagerly received.

R. BONSALL.

REVIEWS

THE MODERNIST MOVEMENT IN THE ROMAN CHURCH: ITS ORIGINS AND OUTCOME. By A. R. Vidler. Cambridge University Press. 1934. 12s. 6d.

The subject prescribed for the Norrisian Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge for the year 1933 was "The Origins and Outcome of the Modernist Movement condemned by the Encyclical *Pascendi Gregis*." The judges who awarded the prize to Mr. Vidler must have felt that he was happily inspired to disregard the exact letter of the subject as proposed, and to concentrate instead on the history of the movement itself as determined by the attitude and interests, both religious and intellectual, of its chief representatives. For the result has been something as near to an adequate account and just appreciation of the movement as we are ever likely to have, certainly something more than the "general introduction" which alone Mr. Vidler modestly professes to have given us.

In an introductory section Mr. Vidler reviews the various liberal tendencies which were operative in the Roman Church throughout the nineteenth century:—the Liberal Catholic movement in France from its inception with the *Avenir* Group down to Gratry and Ollé-Laprune; the new apologetic of Möhler and the Tübingen school in Germany, and later the still more revolutionary positions of Döllinger and his numerous disciples; in Italy the reforming crusade of Rosmini and Gioberti; and in England Newman's theory of doctrinal development. But he justly contends that none of these movements was, or in the nature of the case could have been, causally associated with the characteristic positions and aims of Modernism. It is true that Blondèl and his Oratorian disciple Laberthonnière were in some measure influenced by Ollé-Laprune, and that some of the Italian Modernists occasionally thought of themselves as reviving in certain regards the work of Gioberti. Even Loisy, when he had made a belated discovery of Newman, hailed him as the most open-minded theologian the Church had seen since Origen. But Modernism was in the main independent of all forms of the earlier Liberal Catholicism just because the problems it had set itself to solve were of a wholly different character from any which had called for solution before.

Mr. Vidler, indeed, recognizes quite clearly the variety of interests and motives which went to the formation of the movement that came to be known as Modernism. As M. Loisy

wrote after its condemnation by the Encyclical *Pascendi*: "The so-called modernists are not a homogeneous and united group, as one would suppose if one consulted the papal encyclical, but a quite limited number of persons, who share the desire to adapt the Catholic religion to the intellectual, moral, and social needs of the present time." The history of Modernism is best conceived of as a number of convergent spiritual biographies, and it is Mr. Vidler's conspicuous merit as its historian that he has recognized this fact and been guided by it in his choice of method. Whatever unity the movement came to have arose naturally out of this convergent, but by no means coincident, reaction of certain scholars and thinkers within the Roman Church to new modes of thought and knowledge which towards the end of the nineteenth century had become a cumulative and formidable challenge to the traditional Christian apologetic. On the one hand, the patient investigation of the New Testament writings, and especially of the Gospels, by a long succession of German scholars and the popularization of their general critical conclusions by the genius of Renan in France had completely transformed the traditional conception of Christian origins. On the other hand, the assaults of the critical philosophy had gradually weakened the purely external defences of religion and forced the apologist back upon a closer examination of its character as a specific type of human experience. This twofold challenge was taken up by Loisy and Tyrrell respectively. Each might have been said to be ploughing a lonely furrow had it not been for the support and encouragement which both received from von Hügel. It was in the encyclopædic mind of the latter that the complementary labours of Loisy and Tyrrell found the momentary unity which gave even a remote plausibility to the representations of the *Pascendi*. That momentary unity indeed passed over into a fresh conflict in the same mind which remained in it unresolved until the end. The evidence for von Hügel's commanding influence in the heyday of the movement, for the measure of his largely subconscious dissatisfaction with it even then, and for Loisy's steady devotion to and satisfaction in the scientific labours which he had undertaken even after the condemnation by authority of the apologetic use of them which he had attempted, has now been massively presented in the Memoirs which M. Loisy published three years ago. The documents without which the history of Modernism could never have been written are now there for all the world to read. It is Mr. Vidler's good fortune that the Memoirs had appeared before he began to write his book. And it may be said at once that he has used them with a fine discretion, and with a perception of their general

fairness, trustworthiness, and sincerity which not all critics of them have manifested. It needed a complete freedom from the prejudice which Loisy's later attitude towards Christianity might have created and has in fact created in the minds of many of his critics to do justice to the true character and the undoubted sincerity of the apologetic which he attempted in *L'Évangile et l'Église* and *Autour d'un Petit Livre*. Mr. Vidler has done full justice both to the sincerity of the attempt and to the reasons for its inevitable failure. Loisy's apologetic consisted in a presentation of the historical development of the Roman Church as an actual system of belief, worship, and discipline out of the faith which had its origin in the Gospels. The Gospels themselves were a creation of faith. That is to say, the interest of their authors in the facts which they narrated was not that of the impartial historian, but of the religious believer who wished to convey to others the religious meaning he had already found in them. It was the task of the critical historian to try to get behind this interpretation of faith as nearly as possible to the facts and their connection as they would have looked to the impartial contemporary onlooker. Loisy's own reconstruction of the facts even in 1903 did not differ materially from that which he has given us in his recent *La Naissance du Christianisme*. But in 1903 he still believed that the faith-interpretation which the authors of the Gospels had put upon those facts was justified, if only because out of it had grown the great faith-system which has created the European soul and nurtured it through nearly two millenniums.

Tyrrell's problem was not essentially different, but his line of approach was. He had accepted the results of Biblical criticism in as radical a degree as Loisy himself. But his special difficulty was the reconciliation of theology and revelation. The traditional orthodoxy had practically identified them. The intellectual formulæ in which the Christian belief had been stated in the Conciliar age or later by papal pronouncements had been invested with the character of Divine and therefore irreformable truth. This seemed to Tyrrell the sterilization of religion. True religion had always a prophetic character; and prophecy was always of the nature of revelation, an immediate impress of the Divine Nature which, as truth, could be received or conveyed only through some more or less inadequate symbolism. Tyrrell's apologetic was therefore of a much wider, but also of a much less definite, import than Loisy's.

Mr. Vidler's appreciations of Loisy and Tyrrell and his contrast of their respective rôles and contributions are eminently judicial and sympathetic. And the same may be said of his briefer sketches of von Hügel, Le Roy, Laberthonnière,

Fogazzaro, Buonaiuti, Miss Petre, and other more subordinate figures. He has caught exactly what was characteristic and important in the attitude and convictions of these leaders as they appeared to those who knew them best a quarter of a century ago. Only in one minute instance does a judgment of his seem doubtful. Commenting on Blondel's escape from the condemnation which was visited upon his disciple Laberthonnière, he says that it was only when the philosophy of action "was applied in such a way as to call in question the traditional views of dogma in general, and of this dogma or that in particular, that it was unlikely to meet even with toleration from ecclesiastical authority." "It was because Laberthonnière and Le Roy did this," he adds, "that they were condemned." That of course is true of Le Roy, but not of Laberthonnière. The latter was not interested in Biblical criticism and was known to his friends to have been in his beliefs completely unaffected by it. In one of his *Essais*, if the present writer's memory serves him aright (he is writing far away from books), he distinctly asserts his belief in the Virgin Birth, and that certainly not by way of self-protection, but as a necessary illustration of the position he was at the moment defending. Yet Mr. Vidler's view of the general motives of condemnation is no doubt in the main sound, even though it does not apply in Laberthonnière's case.

What was the outcome of the Modernist Movement—that is to say, its outcome as a reforming movement within the Roman Church? The answer is, None. The root-and-branch condemnation of it by the encyclical of 1907, followed by the disciplinary measures and the anti-modernist oath of 1910, resulted in its complete suppression by the extrusion or submission of all those who had been in any way identified with it. But outside the Roman Communion its influence still persists. That influence cannot of course be felt operatively and in its distinctive character save where similar conditions are present and a similar effort is recognized as necessary. In other words, it will be felt only where what may be called the Catholic type of religion recognizes that it is living in a rapidly changing world and believes that it can accommodate itself without loss of its essential truth to the legitimate requirements of that world. In the High Church Movement in German Lutheranism under the leadership of Friedrich Heiler these conditions exist. But Mr. Vidler contends that they exist on a larger and more operative scale in our own Communion. The Catholic Movement in the Church of England he divides into three sections, one (negligible so far as numbers are concerned) whose declared aim is to prepare the way for submission to Rome, a second which

is unwilling to move beyond the *Lux Mundi* position and which, no doubt, still represents the great majority of those who claim a distinctively Catholic heritage within the English Church, and a third which is definitely aware of the need of a more modern type of Catholic apologetic than that which *Lux Mundi* supplied. It is this last which has been directly influenced by the Roman Modernist Movement, and which has inherited from it at least the form of the problems to be solved and the temper in which they must be faced. From it most of the theology which really counts among us these last few years has proceeded. The actual substance of that theology may vary in the measure in which it is prepared to depart from traditional positions, but it is animated by a common temper of courage and forward outlook. Mr. Vidler even admits the probability that "if it is true that the Liberal Catholic element in the Churchman's Union is growing stronger, Modern Churchmanship will ultimately coalesce with that school of High Church theology." Such a coalition, if it came about, would mean in the English Church that fusion of the Catholic and Evangelical traditions for which Dr. Heiler stands, and which he regards as essential to the recovery of an integral Christianity.

Mr. Vidler's book is not only a very fine accomplishment of the task which he set himself in writing it. It is also incidentally a direction post indicating the line of advance which English theology may most usefully and fruitfully take in the immediate future.

A. L. LILLEY.

THE ECCENTRIC LIFE OF ALEXANDER CRUDEN. By Edith Olivier. Faber and Faber. 12s. 6d.

Among the ponderous books which I inherited from my grandparents were Brown's Bible and Cruden's Concordance. I often wondered who Brown was, and what merit, presumption or delusion made him claim the Bible as particularly his. Cruden I took to be a Professor of Divinity, for who else would have the time or the patience to write a Concordance ?

And now I wish this book had never been written. It has an easy style, it is well constructed, it deals with an unusual personality. But poor little Cruden was such a pathetic figure. He was always offering his attentions and his services where they were not wanted. He had the sensitiveness to go nearly or quite mad when he was rebuffed, and not the sense to refrain from offering what people did not require. Some readers may enjoy the picture of the unfortunate little man on his knees before his imposing patron the tenth Earl of Derby, who had dismissed Cruden from his service because his French pronuncia-

tion was all wrong; Cruden weeping and imploring, the Earl haughty and bored. The sight merely makes me uncomfortable. Cruden was talented, kind-hearted, queer; and he had an extraordinary life. The kindest thing one can do for him is to forget him.

Will Edith Olivier write a book about Brown, perhaps, and why he had a Bible?

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE STATE AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. Being an examination of the present position with some suggestions for its improvement by E. F. Braley, M.A., LL.D., Principal of Bede College, Durham, and M. C. Petitpierre, M.A., Chaplain of Bede College, Durham. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. A Manual for Teachers and Clergy by Canon J. R. Lumb, M.A., formerly Director of Religious Education in the Diocese of Blackburn. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The State and Religious Education.—This book is an attempt to clarify the issues involved in the problem of religious education, and it is published as a stimulant to discussion. The first part is critical. It examines the claim of the State to educate the whole child intellectually, physically and morally, with a view to producing full men and women. The authors assert that their experience of young people abundantly indicates that the educational system of the country is doing no such thing, and they shew that if this object is to be achieved there must be a dominant purpose in life capable of satisfying human nature at every stage of experience, and strong enough to unify divergent interests in the promotion of what is noblest and highest. To supply and inculcate such a dominant purpose is clearly the duty of every educational system. The authors find this purpose only in seeking the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and they give reason to shew that the country as a whole has declared itself to this effect. To quote Lord Irwin: "No system of State education can afford to ignore the vital element of religion in the face of the many disintegrating forces at work."

The authors proceed to an examination of the statute law and the publications of the Board of Education in regard to religious education in both primary and post-primary schools, and they enquire into what is actually being done in the matter.

The conclusions are not very happy. The authors find that instead of being a primary and essential subject religious instruction has become secondary and optional. Impartiality towards varieties of religious belief has tended in practice to

become neutrality; and neutrality, without at first intending it, is apt to end in neglect and thus in positive injury.

The teachers approach the subject in a serious spirit, but in many cases both in provided and non-provided schools there is lacking the necessary knowledge which is required to teach the subject. Speaking generally, even in elementary schools, provided and non-provided alike, religious knowledge is the worst taught subject in the curriculum, and the position in State-aided secondary schools is generally much worse than in elementary schools. Some methods of teaching universally discarded from secular lessons as unsound are still sometimes found in religious instruction, while other methods constantly in use for the teaching of other subjects are neglected. The Training Colleges can give effective instruction in the methods of teaching English or history or chemistry, because their students arrive with some knowledge of the subjects, but the Church Training Colleges find that many of their students lack the most elementary Bible knowledge, and are not in a position, therefore, to learn methods of imparting it to others. Moreover, the students in Church Colleges are only some 3,655 out of a total in two-year Colleges of about 11,300, whereas there was a time when the number was 2,225 out of a total of 3,355 !

These general conclusions will be accepted by those who are in a position to know the subject from experience of school management and inspection, but they should be an incentive for all people of goodwill to co-operate for an improvement, and for this object the outlook is now promising. It is in this spirit that we should read the second part entitled "Constructive," and proceed to Canon Lumb's book, which gives the fruits of a united effort throughout a diocese to bring the teaching of religious knowledge up to the level of the best taught of the secular subjects.

If the subject is approached with this purpose, we may be content to concentrate on what is helpful. There is a sentence in the Board of Education *Handbook of Suggestions to Teachers* which expresses what we feel about religious teaching "which when given with knowledge and sincerity can and ought to play the supreme part in training mind, personality and character"; and there is another which recognizes the importance of the teacher's vocation: "Ultimately, it has been said, what every teacher teaches is himself. Whatever methods he may adopt, there is no doubt that his own character will be the most potent influence in determining the ideals of his pupils." We may adopt these words as an official introduction to Canon Lumb's admirable chapters on the teacher's ministry and the training of the children of God.

In *The State and Religious Education* the authors record their "unalterable conviction that effective Christianity is faith in a Person through a society." Canon Lumb's book deals with Church schools, which have the advantage of providing Church teaching for Church children in direct connection with the life that centres on the parish church, but the other book sets out to shew that the provided school can make a valuable contribution to the Christian education of the child through school worship and religious instruction without contravening the limitations of the Cowper-Temple clause. It emphasizes the religious value of a scholarly knowledge of the Bible and the importance of imparting it by the historical method of approach.

The authors note that the Churches and the Local Education Authorities are co-operating as never before in the matter of "agreed syllabuses," but they do not mention the unique opportunity which is now offered to the Church by the appeal of the Hadow report for co-operation in establishing the modern or senior school as an integral part of our national system. Local Education Authorities which identify themselves with this appeal recognize that the redistribution of children between Church junior schools and Council senior schools can only be effected by consent; they agree that if for the welfare of the children, the Church will thus, by consent, do more than the Statute requires, the Council may well be asked to do all that the Statute permits. This has led to a great advance in some areas; the Local Education Authorities have set up Joint Advisory Committees in co-operation with diocesan panels; they have made public declaration that the education given in provided schools is a religious education; their regulations provide that every school-day shall begin with worship; they require that definite instruction shall be systematically given in every school upon the lines of an agreed syllabus, and state that the same standard of efficient teaching is required for this as for all other subjects; they provide that if no teacher on the staff is available, the managers, subject to the approval of the Education Committee, may engage other persons to give the religious instruction; they appoint inspectors of religious instruction (usually a Church of England clergyman and a Free Church minister); they recommend books and supply them to all schools on requisition—*e.g.*, the Leicestershire series of *Prayers and Hymns*, *Hymns of the Kingdom*, the *Oxford Handbook of Religious Knowledge*, the *Little Bible*—they adopt some form of the Anson bye-law and allow its application in the withdrawal of children for attendance at Church services on specified dates, and in other ways. These provisions have a

great cumulative value, they may be agreed upon in the set terms of a concordat, and when once in operation they are likely to be permanent because they are based on voluntary agreement, with public opinion behind them. Our authors rightly say that the country as a whole has in effect declared its belief that religion should be the basis of all education (subject, of course, to a conscience clause for both teachers and pupils), but they are also right in attributing much of the present weakness, particularly in secondary schools and modern universities, to the bitter experience of religious controversy. It is in the new spirit of co-operation and agreement that the hope of the future now lies.

Both books have interesting chapters on the syllabus subjects and how to teach them, but it is agreed that in many cases, in schools of all kinds, there is lacking the necessary knowledge which is required to teach the subject. That is the really urgent problem. Canon Lumb would establish contact through diocesan inspectors and Church tutorial classes and help the teachers to master the subject by the systematic study of a small library. It is certainly the best solution so far as it is attainable, but many teachers lack the time and inclination to adopt it. The Oxford Diocesan Council of Education has made an attempt to face the problem in a large diocese of three counties by issuing the *Oxford Handbook of Religious Knowledge* as an authoritative exposition of the teaching which Church teachers are appointed to give, together with an edition suitable for provided schools. It is hoped that it may lead to further study, but the immediate purpose is to provide the teacher with a single book, which if used with Bible and Prayer Book will give him all that is needed to enable him to assimilate and impart the whole body of teaching that is required.

Our authors make useful suggestions on School Worship, and give the subject the place which it should hold in the treatment of religious education.

Canon Lumb's book should be specially valuable to those who are taking up the work of diocesan inspection. He knows its value, and there is a useful section on the subject, but we may not altogether agree with his view of the inspector's authority. He says that the diocese acts as the servant of the managers in providing inspection, "the inspection, it should be clearly understood, is not on behalf of the diocese, since the diocese as such has no *locus standi* in the school." But the Education Act, 1921, recognizes that the trust deed may give the bishop the power of deciding whether the character of the religious instruction is or is not in accordance with the provisions of the trust deed. The opportunity of diocesan inspec-

tion may therefore be regarded as an offer made to the managers by the bishop, who will send his commissioned representatives if the offer is accepted, and they will report to him as well as to the managers.

The two books may be read together and may be warmly commended to all who are interested in the subject.

STEPHEN M. WINTER,
Vice-Chairman of the Oxford Diocesan Council of Education.

WARGRAVE,
August, 1934.

NOTICES

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD. By A. C. Bouquet, D.D. Heffer. 5s.

Dr. A. C. Bouquet here completes his encyclopædic series of handbooks on religion. The previous six volumes have dealt in order with the ordinary arguments for the existence of God, religious experience, Church history, the world and man, man and deity (comparative religion), and Jesus. The present book presupposes these discussions, and accepts "Christian Theism with a progressively panentheistic tendency," after an exhaustive examination of all possible explanations—viz. Scepticism, Materialism, Mentalistic Atheism (principally Bertrand Russell and McTaggart) Reverent Agnosticism, Pluralism, Dualism and Pantheism. Theism gives "a true sense of coherence," and also allows for an historical revelation.

The Divine attributes are then considered, and a catalogue not claimed to be exhaustive is carefully considered; it comprises eleven and those are: Pure Being, Intelligence, Wisdom and Maximum Personality, Active and Purposive Intention, Omnipresence, Wise Parenthood, Holy Love, Omnipotence, Infinitude, Immutability and yet Self-limitation, Perfection, Unity, Eternity and Moral Holiness. Dr. Bouquet holds that Deity may contain both total freedom from limitations with impersonality, and also personality plus limitations, as the only true and full Person in the universe. Deity is within the process of conflict, and in the last resort not impassible.

Every liberal protest against the slogans of Barthianism is welcome, and here we have a strong one. Dr. Bouquet presents three short propositions on page 81, based on facts, which dispose of the dogmatic *finitum non capax infiniti*, to sunder absolutely discovery and revelation.

The book concludes with chapters on the discipline of character by means of religious observances, very wisely expressed.

W. J. FERRAR.

EINLEITUNG IN DIE PSALMEN. By H. Gunkel. Completed by J. Begrich. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. M. 13.50.

Gunkel's great work on the Psalms was published as follows: in 1926 the Commentary; in 1928 the first half of the Introduction; in 1933 the rest of the Introduction. The whole runs to about 1,100 pages and

perhaps 700,000 words. The general lines of the book were explained in a lengthy review in our columns in November, 1932. It is sufficient here to emphasize the exceeding greatness of the work, which will be consulted for the next fifty years at least. It is most unlikely that an English translation will ever appear. That such treasures are locked up in a foreign language should in itself be a sufficient inducement to learn German.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE SOCIAL TRIUMPH OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH. By Shirley Jackson Case. Allen and Unwin. 1934. 6s.

This is a valuable example of how to use the past for guidance in the present day. The author has sketched the history of the Early Church to shew the development of Christianity from its first ultra-individualistic "other-worldly" type, with the expectation, among many at least, of an imminent end of the world, to a gradual recognition of the full worth of human knowledge, society, and government. The final result of the Christianizing of thought, of social life, and of the State was more clearly seen in the fourth century, but he makes us see how it was the result of a long process of expansion and victory.

He works out his theme in five chapters. The first four are entitled "Ancient Religion and Human Values," "Christianity and Worldly Goods," "Christianity and Social Progress," and "Christianity and Politics." In the fifth he points out the changes in social life that are all round us today, which present problems so similar in principle and so different in detail. The chapters were originally given as lectures, so they are easy to read, clear and direct, while they are the outcome of wide reading and sure knowledge. He refers to the main authorities on the subject, English, French and German, and makes us realize the human life that lay behind the passages he quotes.

Though he does not explicitly point it out, his studies emphasize that this Humanism was involved from the first in the Incarnation. For Christ, taking a real human nature which was not destroyed by union with the divine, hallowed all human life. Puritanism is essentially Apollinarian or Eutychian, while the Catholic conception of Christianity was not a paganizing of the primitive Gospel, as Liberal Protestants would have us believe, but a conquest of human society by the living Christ in the Church.

So when he comes to apply the lessons of the earliest chapters to our modern similar task he is a little hampered. His point of view seems to be that of American Protestantism. He deplores the divisions of Christians, which were such a hindrance also in the Early Church. He speaks of Ministers and protests. He presents the problem as the prophet, whereas his lectures shew the necessity of the priest. Surely it was the Catholic nature of the Church that secured the victory. Greek Catholicism conquered the intellectual world of Pagans and Gnostics in the East. Roman (though not yet Papal) Catholicism converted the Government and the State in the West, and the tasks before us in social life are, it would seem, those which must be met by "Northern" Catholicism today.

CLEMENT F. ROGERS.

CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE MODERN WORLD. By the Very Rev. Francis Underhill. Mowbray. 6s. net.

The Dean of Rochester has really reviewed his own book with great justice in the admirable introduction in which he sets forth his aim. He is conscious of the massed attacks upon the Christian religion contained in writings, some of which "on their own lines are really great ones," but many of which are trivial and as worthless as they are specious. On the Christian side there is no lack of apologists, but they are usually too erudite and technical in their writing to be of help to the man of average intelligence but with no theological equipment. The present work undertakes to meet the needs of such readers in ordinary language. But there is much more here than mere "apology"—indeed, as apology the book would be inadequate to the needs of anyone who had been puzzled by certain lines of attack on the Christian religion which are frequently to be met with. What the book gives is a constructive account of what Christian living ought to involve. There is a place, and that an important one, for intelligent study; but even more important is the practice of Christian morality, of discipline and above all of prayer. As the author himself says somewhere near the end of the book, "This book is first and last concerned not so much with doctrine as with living." As such it will be a most useful book for the clergy to have because of its suggestiveness for the sermon maker and because it is the kind of book to lend to intelligent enquirers.

A. R. BROWNE WILKINSON.

RELIGION AND THE SCIENCES OF LIFE. By William McDougall, F.R.S., London. Methuen and Co. Ltd. Pp. 263. 8s. 6d.

We have here fifteen essays selected from the work of forty years dealing with religion, evolution, psychic research and eugenics. Coming from a scientist, the exposure of the bankruptcy of the mechanistic psychology of the nineteenth century and the full recognition of purposive activity are valuable, especially in the essay on "Apollonian and Dionysian theories." Dr. McDougall shews himself a convinced believer in the value of psychical research, and regards it as an ally of religion and a weapon against materialism for an age when the dignity of life is lost sight of: he pleads strongly for its recognition as a University study. He takes the side of Lamarck against the dominant neo-Darwinians, and gives an interesting account of his own lengthy experiments with thirty-seven generations of rats, which go to prove the fact of transmission of acquired qualities in some degree; he laments the backwardness of biology and psychology, compared with physical science, in view of the precarious state of society, and calls loudly for "more science," science of a directly human character developed in economics and psychology to cure the world's chaos.

Several essays deal with Eugenics; the views on "Family Allowances" put forward in 1906 are repeated in 1933; the intervening period has made them acceptable to the best minds.

Throughout we are in contact with a thinker of independence and sincerity, whose fate, as he says, is "to espouse unpopular causes; but to support them so temperately and with so much critical reserve that I am as little acceptable to the minority in opposition as to the dominant crowd."

W. J. FERRAR.

GOD AT WORK. A Study of the Supernatural. By William Adams Brown, D.D. S.C.M. 6s.

Professor William Adams Brown has written a quite comprehensive defence of the belief in the supernatural from the basis of religious experience. He follows in more detail his *Pathways of Certainty*. The supernatural to him is God at work, a living and creative reality in life, and the only clue to the "good" life. He examines the varying experience of Karl Barth, the Anglo-Catholic at Mass, Frank Buchmann and the Groups, Kagawa and Gandhi, and sounds the depths of the characteristics of the life of faith in its assurance, joyfulness, and ready acceptance of suffering, documented with the statements of modern people. In a telling chapter he crosses swords with the extravagances of Behaviourism; granted all psychology can prove, it answers no final question about the experiences to which physical phenomena are linked.

Then he expounds his old contribution to apologetics, his theory of miracle, as inseparable from man's awareness of nature, and life; it is a luminous surprise at the aspect of things, and rooted in experience. The point is that miracle must be understood as in nature, and not outside nature. This view of nature does not (against Dewey) eliminate God; it explains Him as a revealing and responsive Person. As such He is seen active in history, and His supreme and satisfying manifestation is Jesus Christ; from strictly experimental premisses the Professor finds justification for the doctrine of the Trinity.

He ends with an examination of the ideals of sainthood, and the place of Church, Bible and Sacraments in the working out of man's relation to God.

It is a sane and clear piece of work; but it is unwise for apologists, in the present position of scientific theory, to stake as much as is here done on the indeterminate in nature.

W. J. FERRAR.

SAGA OF SAINTS. By Sigrid Undset. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

If any of the readers of THEOLOGY have any illusions about Vikings, they must be prepared to give them up. Vikings were the true representatives on earth of the diabolic Norse gods, and there is nothing to be said in their favour at all. Their picturesque helmets were a myth, and their deeds were evil.

Christianity seems to have been brought to Norway in Viking fashion at the point of the sword, and conversion was usually by force. It is natural, then, that early Norwegian saints should be warrior saints. What wonder, too, if the old gods were worshipped secretly, when the servants of the Christian God still clung to the barbaric virtues ?

Sigrid Undset, herself an ardent Catholic, dislikes Lutherans with an almost Viking bitterness. Let us hope that she would not persecute them if she had the chance.

After the fierce and stormy legends of the early part of the book it is a relief to turn to the last chapter where we have the life of Father Karl Schilling, the Barnabite, a saint as yet uncanonized. We note with pleasure that his Lutheran father was loving and tolerant, and never opposed his son's religious convictions. Young Karl Schilling, who was

then an artist, is first shewn to us standing in a street in Düsseldorf on Corpus Christi Day, 1854, watching a procession go by. He never thought of kneeling down, and was quite surprised when a stranger indignantly knocked off his hat. Karl listened courteously when a daughter of his landlady explained to him why he should have uncovered his head and knelt. And thus he was drawn to Catholicism. He was then nineteen, and it was not till he was thirty-four that he entered a Barnabite monastery at Aubigny-sur-Nère.

It is hard to describe the sanctity of a religion in all its simplicity and humility, but Sigrid Undset has done this well. We get the impression of a character that in its main outlines resembled that of Saint Jean Vianney, the Curé d'Ars. Dom Charles-Marie Joseph had the same gift of insight, the same power over sinners, and he lived the same austere and self-sacrificing life. In him, indeed, the Christian God had triumphed, and no trace of the old gods and the Vikings remained.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

BOOK NOTES

Pascal. By Jacques Chevalier. Sheed and Ward. 1933. 6s. This is a cheap reissue of the translation published in 1930. The French original has all the clearness characteristic of that nation, and the translation retains that quality.

W. J. S. S.

The Nature of Belief. By M. C. D'Arcy. Sheed and Ward. 5s. A cheap reissue of a book which Dr. Inge praised so highly as an exposition of the "classical tradition," or *philosophia perennis*.

Concerning the Ministry: Suggestions to the Parish Clergy and others, especially to Ordinands. By T. A. Bold. The Faith Press. 2s. 6d. cloth, 1s. 6d. paper. Excellent common-sense advice by a priest who believes in the parochial system, visiting and preaching.

W. K. L. C.

The Church and the Ministry of Healing. Essays by Bishop Hough and others. Edited by T. W. Crafer, D.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. A timely book. Generally the Christian student of psychology and of the relation between body, mind and spirit cannot help contrasting the solidity of the technical writings of the psychotherapeutic doctor and of the more responsible psychologist with the sketchiness of the books written from the expressly Christian point of view. This is an accident of the situation rather than essential. The great Christian books on the subject remain to be written. This is a useful symposium dealing wisely, though briefly, with nine aspects of the subject set forth in the title.

St. Paul and His Writings in the Light of Today. By Edith Ratcliffe. Allen and Unwin. 5s. A misleading publisher's note on the paper jacket states: "This is a book for those to whom many of the old religious beliefs have become outworn and who are looking for something

better to take their place." In spite of this detrimental advertisement the book has real merits. The authoress is a little apt to come to a ready decision on debatable points, but the matter is handled with lucidity and the arrangement is excellent.

C. of E. What does it stand for? By the Bishop of Bradford. Mowbray. 1s. 6d. A Visitation Charge to the clergy of the diocese. Much wisdom in small compass. The Bishop has the teacher's gift of lucidity and the mental habit of combining lucidity with compression. Wasting no words, he yet contrives a valuable delineation of the inheritance, the history and the present situation of the Church of England, out of which delineation the details of the Charge issue with singular relevance. A valuable appendix contains a catena of quotations, germane to the subject, from the Caroline Anglican divines.

Religion and Dictatorship. By Carl Heath. Allenson. 2s. 6d. The title is misleading. Only the first of the six chapters is concerned with dictatorship. The other subjects dealt with are The Humane Life, The Quaker Contribution, The Barthian Corrective, Religious and Secular, A Kingdom of Uses. The common factor of all the chapters is a conviction that the old social structure is collapsing and that it behoves Christianity to recognize the fact and to discern and help to mould that which will take its place.

The Revolt against Mechanism. By L. P. Jacks. Hibbert Lectures, 1933. George Allen and Unwin. 2s. 6d. The author defines mechanism as covering not merely machinery but also the systematizing in which humanity is finding itself its own prisoner. Mechanism has filled our cities with all manner of good things; it has lightened the burden of human toil and should have set free the time and energy of man. But on the lines which it has moved it has served to imprison rather than to liberate the spirit of man. It needs to be subordinated to the creative purpose of life. Religion, the supreme creative activity of man, has been affected by it and has itself become over-systematized and insufficiently spontaneous and creative. Not the destruction, but the mastering, of the machine is the desired goal.

A Christian Sociology for Today. An abridged edition of *Faith and Society*. By Maurice B. Reckitt. Longmans. 4s. 6d. The writer pleads for a more definite Christian philosophy of social values. He surveys with knowledge and with a trained critical faculty present-day politics, world order, industry, economics, mechanization, finance. He judges contemporary religion to be too exclusively turned inward in devotion, and to be not expressing itself at all adequately outwards in a clear-cut attitude towards the issues and challenges of the age. In a world of good intentions and a Church full of genuine piety there remains at present a social and industrial deadlock, a spirit of social pessimism, a fear of social disintegration. He believes in a Christian way out and gives grounds for his belief.

H. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER